DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 338

24

SP 003 726

AUTHOR

Austin, Gilbert R.

TITLE

The Challenge of Assessing Curriculum Changes in New

England. Final Report.

INSTITUTION

New Hampshire Univ., Durham. Bureau of Educational

Research and Testing Services.

SPONS AGENCY

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau

of Research.

BUREAU NO

BR-9-0470

PUB DATE

69

PUD DAIL

GRANT OEG-0-9-390470-4429(010)

NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.95

DESCRIPTORS

Behavioral Objectives, *Curriculum Evaluation, *Educational Research, *Institutes (Training

Programs), Research Methodology

ABSTRACT

A 6-week research training institute was conducted during summer 1969 for 30 participants from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine. Objectives were (1) study of problems inherent in evaluating particular curriculum changes with which the trainee was concerned; (2) study of major alternatives open to educators in terms of educational research methodologies: (3) study of communication techniques applicable to proper implementation of the decisionmaking process at various levels in the educational system; (4) use of modern data processing equipment to facilitate encoding and utilization of research data; and (5) reading of current educational literature relevant to the trainee's research project--the creation of a proposed model to evaluate an educational problem in which he was involved. The schedule consisted of classes in Methods and Techniques of Educational Research and in Research Problems in Education and workshops in use of the computer. A series of pre-and posttest evaluations indicated that the institute was successful both in substantial average gain in knowledge and in development of favorable attitudes. (Included are lists of reading and instructional materials, the institute schedule, and evaluation data and analysis.) (JS)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT CONTRACT NO, OEG-0-9-390470-4429 (010)

The Challenge of Assessing Curriculum Changes in New England

Gilbert R. Austin
Bureau of Educational Research
and Testing Services
University of New Hampshire
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

1969

The institute reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The institute reported herein, under the direction of Gilbert R. Austin, could not have been completed without the cooperation of many other persons.

The author gratefully acknowledges the support and assistance of the following individuals who contributed to the institute and who gave many helpful suggestions:

Dr. Henry H. Walbesser
Associate Professor of Mathematics Education
University of Maryland

Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam Associate Professor Ohio State University

Dr. Desmond Cook
Associate Professor
Ohio State University

Dr., William Asher Professor of Education and Psychology Purdue University

Dr. John Cawley Professor of Education University of Connecticut

Maurice E. Olivier Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services University of New Hampshire

Donald Báiley Computer Programmer University of New Hampshire

Carl M. Kleiner Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services University of New Hampshire

Grateful acknowledgement is also expressed to Mrs. Elaine Gardner for her assistance in typing the rough draft and final copy of this report, and to Mrs. June Hall for her work as the project assistant.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Institute Objectives	1- 3
The Proposed Learning Sequence	4
First and Second Weeks of the Institute	5 ,
Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Weeks of the Institute	6- 7
Discussion of Pre- and Post-Tests	8-14
Titles of Trainees' Proposals	18-19
Dicussion of Computer Programming	19-22
	Appendix
Institute Evaluation Sheet	A
Pre-Test and Post-Test of the Institute	A
"Definition of Action Words"	В
"Evaluation of Science-A Process Approach"	В
"A Hierarchically Based Test Battery for Assessing Scientific Inquiry" by Dr. Henry Walbesser	В
Tasks 1-37	В
"Evâluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making" by Dr. Daniel L. Stufflebeam	С
"Process Approach in Biology Instruction"	c
"Context Evaluation of Instruction in Local School Districts"	*C
"Teachers College Record"	e
"Evaluation at the Local Level"	c
Outline for Project Management Presentation	D
"A Generalized Project Management System Model" by Dr. Desmand Cook	
"What is the System Approach, and What's In It for Administrators?"	E
"Development, Dissemination and Adoption" by Dr. William Asher	
"The Ingredients of the Research Proposal"	



REPORT ON THE HEW SUMMER INSTITUTE - 1969

The Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services; a sub-unit of the Department of Education, University of New Hampshire, conducted a six week research training institute during the period of July 7 to August 15, 1969. The grant provided for the training of thirty participants from any of the six New England states.

This research training institute was funded by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Research Training Division. The institute set for itself the following set of objectives:

1. The first major theme was the study of the problems inherent in evaluating the particular curriculum changes with which the trainee was concerned. The study of the problem of evaluation was approached by having the trainees identify, write, and evaluate objectives for instructional programs in the area of curriculum change in which they were interested.

Specific objectives:

At the end of the program the participants demonstrated their ability to perform the following tasks:

- a) Identify evaluative techniques which can be utilized to provide information for making decisions about curriculum change.
- b) Identify the objectives for a specific program in their area of interest.
- c) Discriminate between well written and poorly written objectives.
- d) Identify and construct performance objectives.
- e) To translate (where possible) into performance objectives the objectives stated in the curriculum guides presently in use in their school systems which are stated in non-verbal terms.



2. The second major theme was the study of the major alternatives open to the educator in terms of educational research methodologies. For instance: the experimental approach as typified by the work of Campbell and Stanley, or the context, input, process and production (CIPP) model as presented by Daniel L. Stufflebeam. In either approach the program review and evaluation techniques, (PERT) developed for education by Desmond Cook, will be advocated as the method of organizing the project.

Specific Objectives

At the end of the program the participants demonstrated their ability to perform the following tasks:

- a) Identify the classification scheme of the CIPP evaluation model.
- b) Construct a research study using either context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation or product evaluation.
- c) Describe the difference between an experimental and a quasi-experimental design for educational research.
- d) Order, using the PERT technique, the planning of an educational research study.
- 3. The third major theme was the study of communications techniques applicable to proper implementation of the decision-making process at various levels of the educational systems.

Specific Objectives

At the end of the program the participants demonstrated their ability to perform the following tasks:

- a) Interpret the research findings of several journal articles.
- b) Demonstrate the competency to apply the findings of a research study to one's local school situation.
- c) Describe the problems associated with dissemination and adoption of the general kind of educational research findings to a local school system.



4. The fourth major theme was the use of modern data processing equipment to facilitate the encoding and utilization of research data.

Specific Objectives

At the end of the program the participants demonstrated their ability to perform the following tasks:

- a) Construct a simple computer program.
- b) Identify the problems associated with designing an optically scannable document.
- c) Demonstrate the ability to operate a remote terminal.
- d) Name and describe the use of a variety of modern data processing equipment and its utilization in educational research.
- 5. The fifth major theme was reading of current educational literature relevant to the research project with which the trainer is involved.

Specific Objectives

At the end of the program the participants demonstrated their ability to perform the following tasks:

- a) To identify the major reference sources for educational research literature.
- b) Construct a bibliography in the area of the trainees interest.
- c) Distinguish the major components of a piece of well written educational research.

At the end of the institute each of the participants was given an evaluation form in which he was asked to evaluate on a four-point scale the attainment by this institute of its specifically stated original objectives. A copy of this evaluation will be found in Appendix A. A mean was calculated not only for each specific objective but also by a grouping of all the specific objectives into a single catagory for each of the five major themes. In general all means are in excess of three points, indicating that the participants felt that the objectives had been well attained at a ranking of between good to excellent.



OBJECTIVES E'ALUATION

```
MEAN( 1)= 3.62 ____
MEAN( 2)= 3.66----1b
MEAN(3) = 3.77 ----1c
MEAN( 4) = 3:77 ---- 1d
MEAN(5) = 3.37 ----1e
MEAN( 6)= 3.59----2a
MEAN(7) = 3.25 -----2b
MEAN( 8)= 2.85----2c
MEAN(9) = 3.03 ----2d
MEAN(10)= 2.84====3a==
MEAN(11) = 3.11 ----3b
MEAN(12)= 3.11 ----3c
MEAN(13) = 3.51 -----4a
MEAN(14)= 3:07 ----4b
MEAN(15)= 2.52 -----4c
MEAN (16)= 3.03 ----4d
MEAN(17) = 3.00 -----5a
MEAN(18)= 2.96 -----5b
MEAN(19) = 3.46 ----5c
MEAN (20) = 0:00
MEAN OF QUESTION 1 3-644444
MEAN OF QUESTION 2 3.185185
MEAN OF QUESTION 3 3.025641
MEAN OF QUESTION 4 3.081632
        QUESTION 5 3-139240
```

At the end of the institute the participants were asked to evaluate the extent to which the institute meet its objectives. This was done on a four point basis, and reduced in similar fashion to the instructor evaluations. (see evaluation form)



The geographical distribution of the participants in this institute was as follows:

Maine	· 2
Vermont	3
New Hampshire	21
Massachusetts	3
Rhode Island	0
Connecticut	0

THE PROPOSED LEARNING SEQUENCE

The institute was conducted daily from 8:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. for six weeks. The institute offered credit in two courses. These two courses are described below:

Education 881, Methods and Techniques of Educational Research. This course is a critical study of the principal methods employed in the investigation of educational problems and an evaluation of the procedures and standards used in reporting the findings; designed as an advanced course for Master's Degree candidates.

Education 882, Research Problems in Education, is concerned with the individual investigation of a problem in the area of educational research. This course will be used first to expose the trainees to a variety of educational research. In the latter portion, each trainee will be expected to develop a research proposal which will have practical importance and relevance to his home district, or to evaluate a project presently being studied.

The two courses described above were offered daily between 8:30 A.M. and 11:45 A.M. The period from 1:00 P.M. through 2:30 P.M. each day was held open for individualized consultation and library research. The institute



met each afternoon from 2:30 P.M. through 4:00 P.M. during which time the trainees were instructed in the use of the computer as an educational tool.

The first week was given over to an intensive study of the construction of behavioral objectives, the design of assessment tasks, the construction of learning sequences and a study of their empirical foundations. Supporting and instructional materials included: The Conditions of Learning, Robert M. Gagne; AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluations; Preparing Instructional Objectives, by Robert F. Mager; Developing Attitude Toward Learning, by Robert F. Mager; a number of audiovisual aids such as the Popham film strip series on objectives as well as the audio-visual series called, "Why Behavioral Objectives?" The participants were also given the following mimeographed handouts:

Definition of Ten Action Words: Evaluation of Science: a Process Approach; A Hierarchically Based Test Battery for Assessing Scientific Inquiry. (Appendix B)

The primary task of the trainees was to read and complete the paperback called, "Constructing Behavioral Objectives" as well as a series of thirty-seven tasks which Dr. Walbesser and the Director of the Institute had worked out during the spring semester. Dr. Walbesser was assisted by two group leaders so that a low 1-10 teacher-student ratio could be maintained in the small group instruction.



The third week of the institute was given over to a study of different models for evaluating education. Supporting instructional materials included, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, by Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley; Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision Making by Daniel L. Stufflebeam; Handbook of Research on Teaching by Nathaniel Gage: Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education by Ferguson; Non-Parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences by Sidney Siegel.

The fourth week of the institute was instructed by Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam. The learning sequence was worked out with Dr. Stufflebeam during the spring semester. He was assisted in his instruction by three group leaders who were trained in the use of the CIPP evaluation model, and were an aid in the small group instruction.

The fifth week, the first two days were given over to a study of the PERT technique in education. The supporting instructional materials included: Program Evaluation and Review Technique, Applications in Education by Desmond L. Cook. The content of that instruction was worked out between Dr. Cook and the project director during the spring semester. The fifth day of the fifth week, Dr. John Cawley, University of Connecticut presented a paper entitled, "Research in Reading and Psychomoter Disabilities."

The sixth week, the first two days were given over to a study of the problems associated with the development, dissemination and adoption (DD&A) processes in education. The third and fourth days were under

the instruction of Dr. William Asher. The content of those two days was worked out between Dr. Asher and the director of the Institute during the spring semester. The fifth day of the sixth week was given over to a presentation by Maurice Olivier. The topic was "The Potential of Systems Thinking in Education".

During the first four weeks of the institute, each afternoon between 2:30 P.M. and 4:00 P.M. the trainees were instructed in the use of the computer. They were taught to identify the basic components of it and were given an introduction to computer programming. The major emphasis of the learning sequence, however, was the demonstration by the trainees of mastery of the use of a remote terminal. During the spring semester a series of simple statistical programs was written and stored so that the institutees could call them out in the memory of the computer and so use them in computational tasks. Therefore, the last two weeks of the institute the trainees were concerned with the use of the computer only as a tool in working on their particular problems. The instructor was available each afternoon between 2:30 P.M. and 4:00P.M. as a resource person to help them in any way that was necessary.

A major requirement of the institute was the creation by each trainee of a proposed model to evaluate the educational problem which which he is involved.

The material which has just been presented is what the author of this particular proposal originally proposed to do. The question now is, how well was it done? In an attempt to assess the adequacy or inadequacy of this summer institute, the following assessment tasks were undertaken: A lengthy pre-test and post-test were constructed. The pre-test and posttest consisted of 160 multiple choice items. These questions were in general drawn from a test designed by Gene V. Glass which was entitled, "Mastery Test Items for Courses in Educational Research Methods". A copy of this pre-test, post-test will be found in Appendix A of this report. A complete set of statistics based on both the pre-test and post-test results are included immediately after this section. They consist of the following: a complete item analysis and item count on each of the questions; the computing of the mean, the standard deviation and the range of scores; the transforming of all scores to z scores and to standard scores; the standard score being based on a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100; a calculation of a frequency distribution as well as cumulative percentile based on that frequency distribution. The print-out of the individual students' scores included their raw score; their percentile rank; their stanine; their standard score and a z score. The mean on the pre-test was 54.48 with a standard deviation of 17.99. The range was from 20 through 95 raw score points. The same complete set of statistics was calculated on the post-test and this is also found immediately following this section. The mean of the post-test was 87.55 with a standard



average gain, then, over the six week period from the pre-test to the post-test was 33.11 score points. This is a very significant gain. Immediately following the test analysis will be found a chart which indicates for the individuals in the institute the raw point score gain and the percent of gain over the six week period. The gain scores go from a low of a 2 point raw score increase to a high of 66 raw score points which is equivalent to a 330% gain over the pre-test score.



ITEM			136" 4 15	# " had q 1 =						. 7	. *
	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCTP	CHOI	8	C	D	E	DK	OMIT	
1	# 42 1	4°9 4				13*	4	0	10		ř
7	000 L	47.4	45 1	2				0	6		, ,
2	62-3	43.3	59	7	ŗ	0,	17*	I			
3	53.9	54.7	31	9*	, 	1 .	2	O 	12		<u>'</u>
4	61.3	50.8	34	4	2	3	10*	Ö	10	, (U	<i>}</i>
5	63.0	42.3	59	l	6	.2	17*	0	3	Q	
6	58.0	45.0	72	21*	6	0	Ŏ	0	2	Ç	,
7	62.7	51.8	24	7*	16	0	3	O	3	C)
8	55.2	53.5	55	2	5	16*	5	Ö	1	C)
9	56.6	46.3	79	23*	0	2	3	0	1	Q)
10	63.1	49.2	3.8	O	11*	11	4	Ö	3	Ç)" "
11	52.1	49.8	38	4	11*	0	3	1	10	Ģ)
12	61.7	46.7	52	4	15*	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1		5)
13	61.8	48.4	45	2	3 -	2	13*	1	. 8	(2)
14	54.9	54.0	52	* · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4	15*	1	Ö	· · · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • •	C	5
15	71.5	53.2	7	2*	Č	12	13	·Õ	2	E	j
16	56.6	44.2	83	24*	a kozakaten	3	tae mediationiscos (como	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ar an early	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5
17	72.6	50.7	17	5*	5	1	9	ŏ	9	•	3
18	58.5	52.9	28			8*	Tá			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
19			97	•	0	0	3	28*	Ġ	ì	3
	55.0	39.0	77	1*		FORM STATE OF STATE O	ere er er er er ska	0	26		<u>.</u>
20	85.0	53.4	3	 .	1	•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		19	,	, 1
21	57.0	54.4		1*	•	5		0			y N
22	58.7	50.5	48	1	Z.	0	14*	ū	12		, <i>j</i>
23	59.0	52.4	31	9*	0	6	0	Ţ	13	<u>,</u>	,J
24	63.0	52.7	1.7	10	5*	2	0	O	12		ַ
25	54.2	54.8	55	C	C	3	16*	2	8	3	2
26	0.0	54.4	1	0	3	0*	7.	4	15	•)
27	59.2	51.6	38	2	5	ð	11*	1	10		ָלֻ ב
28	57.0	48.7	69	. 0	Q	9	20*	0	, 0	,	b
29	54.2	55.1	76	o	2	22*	4	0	1		9
30	54.9	53.0	76	22*	3	1		0	3	· (
31	57.7	52.7	34	5	10*	0	2	0	12	į	0
32	55.5	54.3	14	" 4 " "	4*	17	0	0	4		Ď
33	60.3	47.2	55	1	2	16*	1	0	9		Ō
34	57.1	44.3	79	23*	3	0	O			tur t rapid iche	Ó
35	60.5	43.0	66	19*	4	Ö.	Õ	o '	6	ĺ	Ó
36	52.0	54.7	10	ii	3*	8	ž	Ö	. 5		0
37	47.3	55.3	10	14	ž	3*	Š	ő	· 7		Ö
			41	12*	3	T	6	···			h ·
38	60.0	50 + 5		6*	ب پ	3	13	ŏ	6	,	Ď
39	68.0	50.9	21		and any parties of	i engaran da	8*	ő	10		Ď
40	63.8	50.9	28	3	4	7			•	1	þ
41	57.7	51.8	45	1	13*	8	4	0	3		D
42	67.0	49.7	28	C	16	Ö	8*	O	5		
43	64.5	46.3	45	C	7	3	13*	2	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		0
44	68.2	43.2	45	13*	3	3	· ··· ·· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	O O	10	,	Ü
45	54.7	54.1	52	1	. 5	15*	3	0	8		Ų.
46	56.9	49.7	66		19*	3	2 10 10		3		Ď. "
47	61.4	51.8	28	3	C	0.	2	8*	16	}	Ø
48	77.0	51.8	10	3*	1	T	1	0	23		0 -
49	0.0	54.4	. 1	5	4	0*	1	0	19		0
	58.0	54.3				Market Committee		0	24		0

MEAN P = MEAN OF ALL PASSING TEM
MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM

PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING LITEM

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESTING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND ADMINISTERED JULY 7,1969

STEEN NEAN P NEAN F PCT P A B B C D E DK CMIT	PRET		INISTERED	JULY 1.1.	4.	aleman (aller production de la constitución de la constitución de la constitución de la constitución de la cons	tantono recesso en estas b	akonstiliji eskir es eskir	u a Haraiddhof ar do.	المسافية وراعكاء أدسالا	ANT The sign " and are a go . " .	Discontinue de la constitue de
\$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c	ITEM"	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCTP	-			•	_	_	65.1 7	A414
52 65.2 52.2 17 5* 3 0 0 0 21 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0					A		3 (•	U	t	ยห	UMIT
52 65.2 52.2 17 5* 3 0 0 0 21 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0 25 0		A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A			,				•	_	~*	^
53 75.5 52.9 7 0 0 2* 2 0 25 0 54 56.8 53.2 34 2 0 2 1 10* 15 0 55 52.9 60.5 79 23* 6 0 0 0 0 0 56 58.2 51.8 41 16 12* 0				17	•							···· n ·
54 55 52.9 60.5 79 23** 6 0 0 0 0 55 52.9 60.5 79 23** 6 0 0 0 0 55 58.2 51.8 41 16 12** 0 0 0 0 29 0 57 0.0 54.4 1 0 <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>17</td> <td>_</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-,</td> <td>_</td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>Ü</td>			•	17	_			-,	_	-		Ü
55 52.9 60.5 79 23* 6 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 29 0 0 56 58.2 51.8 28 2.4* 5 0				7	C	1 a: the substitute for the) 	Z 1 4 Dag 2000 - 2000 2 200	Z (2 000 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	_		U 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20
56				-	2			2	I			, 0
58		•		79			•		_	U	y ····································	. U
58 57.7 38.8 83 24* 5 0 0 0 0 59 58.5 53.4 21 3 6* 2 0 0 18 0 60 59.3 54.3 66 6 0 19* 0 0 4 0 61 61.4 51.8 28 1 1 1 8* 4 14 0 63 52.5 54.8 14 4* 2 9 4 0 10 0 64 65.5 55.4 45 5 13* 1 3 0 7 0 65 56.3 35.8 28 0 10 6 0 8* 5 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 0 67 62.6 54.9 17* 5* 0 11 10 0 <				41				~		0	1	0
59			7	1	-) *		0		U
60							· .	9	0		•	Ü
61 61.4 91.8 28 1 1 1 1 8* 4 16 0 62 63.3 53.4 10 5 1 3* 12 1 7 0 63 52.5 54.8 14 4* 2 9 4 0 10 0 64 65.5 45.* 45 5 13* 1 3 0 7 0 65 56.3 53.8 28 0 10 6 0 8* 5 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 67 62.6 46.8 48 6 14* 1 2 2 4 0 68 70.1 40.5 52.8 8* 12 0 0 0 4 5 0 69 56.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 17* 0 5 3 0 4 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 4 1 1 7* 0 1 19 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8 0 0 12 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 31.1 21 0 6* 5 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 13* 1 0 0 2 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 10* 0 5 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 83 54.4 55.6 53.5 45 2 10 3* 0 0 1 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 10 3* 0 0 1 85 65.2 46.8 41 5 3 0 0 10 25 86 65.2 46.8 51.3 52.6 17 5* 13 1 1 9* 0 15 87 62.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 0 6 88 61.8 51.7 28 1 3 1 1 9* 0 15 89 61.1 46.3 55 45 15 2 13* 1 2 0 7 91 76.6 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 92 61.0 53.7 10 3 4 2 5 0 14 93 68.7 48.0 35.7 10 3 4 2 5 0 14 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5 4 5 5 0 14 95 71.8 50.8 1.9 17 1 5 5 6 3 0 14 0 97 76.6 6.8 51.9 17 17 5 5 0 15 0 97 76.6 85.1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					. 3				0	0	1.85	U .
62 63.3 53.4 10 5 1 3* 12 1 7 0 63 52.5 54.6 14 4* 2 9 9 4 0 10 0 0 66 65.5 545.* 45 5 5 13* 1 3 0 7 0 65 56.3 53.8 28 0 10 6 0 8* 5 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 66 76.6 46.8 48 6 14* 1 2 2 4 0 68 70.1 48.5 28 8* 12 0 0 4 5 0 0 68 5 6.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 12* 0 5 3 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8* 0 0 1 2 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8* 0 0 1 2 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 10* 4 0 14 0 77 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 77 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 77 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 77 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 77 78 67.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 0 9 0 88 61.8 53.0 1 0 9 0 1 0 1 0 25 0 88 71.6 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 0 9 0 0 88 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 1 9* 0 1 25 0 88 61.8 55.6 53.5 45 2 1 3 1 1 1 9* 0 1 1 23 0 0 9 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 86 4 59.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 66.4 59.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 66.4 59.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 66.4 59.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 66.4 59.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 9 0 0 0 0 0 9 0 0 0 0		•			the value time and attitude to the constitution of	PARTIE A CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE	D	9*****	'O	Ψ. Ο	4	
63					1		1.	l		4	14	- •
04 65.5 45.4 45. 45 5 13* 1 3 0 7 0 65 56.3 53.8 28 0 10 6 8* 5 0 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 Z 25* 0 Z 0 0 0 67 62.6 46.8 48 6 14* 1 Z 2 Z 4 0 68 70.1 48.5 28 8* 12 0 0 4 5 0 0 4 5 0 0 69 56.5 53.9 21 0 Z 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 77 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 Z 0 3 0 74 50 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8 1 0 0 1 2 0 3 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 1 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 1 0 0 1 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0					and the second of the second o	fine realistic of course and ord	-	-	2	I	7	
65 56.3 53.8 28 0 10 6 0 8* 5 0 66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 68 56.3 86.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 68 70.1 48.5 28 8* 12 0 0 4 5 0 69 56.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 56.9 53.8 59 17* 0 5 3 3 0 4 0 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 8* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 8* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 8* 1 0 0 1 23 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 3* 0 0 1 0 0 1 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0					4			9	4	_	10.	
66 55.8 46.3 86 0 2 25* 0 2 0 0 67 62.6 46.8 48 6 14* 1 2 2 4 0 0 68 70.1 48.5 28 8* 12 0 0 4 5 5 0 69 56.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 8 4 13 0 0 10* 0 6 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 17* 0 5 3 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 1 0 0 12 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 75 60.5 52.5 11 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 75 60.5 52.5 11 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 75 60.5 52.5 11 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 75 60.5 52.5 11 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 75 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 14 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15 0					oko — o za daspirito kaledonian o un semen 💆			I	3	_	·····	<u> </u>
67 62-6 46.8 48 6 14* 1 2 2 4 0 0 68 70.1 48.5 28 8* 12 0 0 4 5 0 0 69 56.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 1 9 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 17* 0 5 3 0 5 4 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 8 8 8 8 0 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 8 8 8 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 23 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 1 22 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 22 0 77 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 22 0 77 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 0 1 23 0 77 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 0 22 0 77 7 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 0 1 23 0 77 7 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 0 1 23 0 77 7 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 0 0 1 22 0 77 7 7 63.8 53.0 14 54 54 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 0 22 0 77 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7					. 0			_	O	8*	5	0
68 70.1					Committee and the contract of			5* ***********************************	<u> </u>		*** **********************************	
69 56.5 53.9 21 0 2 6* 0 11 10 0 70 52.2 54.9 17 5* 0 19 0 0 5 0 71 58.0 52.6 34 13 0 0 10* 0 6 0 72 55.4 54.1 24 1 1 7* 0 1 19 U 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 17* 0 5 3 0 5 0 14 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8 1 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 5* 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 34 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 71 1 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			•					1		2	4	0
70	68	70.1	48.5					-	-		3	0
71	69	56.5	53.9				· ·		0	11	10	0
72 55.4 54.1 24 1 7* 0 1 19 0 73 58.0 41.0 79 0 23* 1 2 0 3 0 74 54.9 53.8 59 7* 0 5 3 0 5 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6* 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 8 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 48.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 15 0 85 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 3 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 15 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 2* 17 2 5* 5 0 13 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	70	52.2	54.9	17		The second second	0 1			0	5	
73	71	58.0	52.6	24	13		Q	0 1	0*	0	6	0
74 54.9 53.8 59 17 0 5 3 0 4 0 75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 8 8 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 0 0 1 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 0 0 1 12 0 0 1 23 0 0 78 67.2 31.1 21 0 6 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 96 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	72	55.4	54.1	· Same acres de Land	The processor of the construction of the second sec	energy refrections are extended to	They served acreed in	THE STATE OF THE STATE OF	P. Distriction (By)	A.Z SLAJATA TUSANA		"
75 60.5 52.9 21 4 0 6 5 0 14 0 76 62.6 51.3 28 8 1 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 0 0 12 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 34 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 5 4 5 5 0 0 0 1 0 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 3 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 13 0 93 58.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 4 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 1 5 0 19 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.8 50.8 17 6 2 8 1 0 15 0	73	58.0	41.0	79	40 g g	and the second of the	3*	1	2	0	-	• .
76 62.6 51.3 26 8 1 8 0 0 12 0 77 63.8 53.0 14 4* 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 34 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1 * 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 1 12 0 0 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 90 68.* 49.1 28 5 5 1 8* 0 7 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 13 0 93 58.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.* 17 2 5* 4 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	74	54.9	53.8	59	17	A CONTRACT OF LANGUAGE	0	\$	3	•		. 0
77 63.8 53.0 14 4 1 0 0 1 23 0 78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1 * 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 5 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3 5 2 3* 0 14 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 4 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 1 7* 6 0 19 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	75	-60.5	52.9	21	land and		0	6 *	5	0		. 0
78 67.2 51.1 21 0 6* 1 0 0 22 0 79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 9 9 0 90 68.4 99.1 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 15 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 1 7* 6 3 0 14 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	76	62.6	51.3	28	and the second s	The second secon		8*		in the second		0
79 70.6 45.9 36 1 0 10* 4 0 14 0 80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 0 26* 0 2 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <	77	63.8	53.0	14		*	1	Ø	0	1		0
80 63.2 52.6 17 5* 1 13 1 0 9 0 81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 86 65.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 11 1 18 0 12 0 0 11 1 18 0 12 0 0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 10 0 1 0<	78	6772	ST-1	or or a supposition and the supplementary of the su	Company of the company of the state of	A section of the second	6 * s sint connerve	Transfer to the second	"O "	0		
81 74.3 52.2 10 3* 0 0 1 0 25 0 82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 0 0 10 0 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 <t< td=""><td>79</td><td>70 +6</td><td>45.9</td><td>34</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>0 1</td><td>0*</td><td>4</td><td>0</td><td></td><td>.0</td></t<>	79	70 +6	45.9	34	1		0 1	0*	4	0		.0
82 71.6 46.7 31 3 1 1 9* 0 15 0 83 54.4 55.0 90 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3*	80	63.2	52.6	. 17	e av e	5*	l T	3	1	·/···/O		", " O
83 54.4 55.0 96 1 0 0 26* 0 2 0 84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 05.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0	81	74.3	52.2	10	3	3*	C	0	1	0		0
84 55.6 53.5 45 2 13* 1 2 0 11 0 85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.2 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 5 4 58 5 8* 0 7 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 2 5 0 13 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 17* 0 12 0 96 68.1 50.8 17 6 2 5*<	82	71.6	46.7	31		Ban to con-	1	1		.0.	15	0
85 85.0 53.4 3 3 1* 5 1 1 18 0 86 65.3 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 5 4 5 0 7 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 15 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 4 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 1 7* 6 3 0 14 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 50.8 17 6 2 5* 1 0 15 0	83	54.4	55.0	. 90	1	L "	0	0 2	26*	0		0
86 65.2 46.8 41 5 3 12* 0 6 0 87 62.4 51.4 28 0 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0	84	55.6	53.5	45	ace's teads of the control of the c	2 - 1	3*************************************	Trus ston 1,22	2.000	0		··· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
87 62.4 51.4 28 C 8* 3 6 0 12 0 88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 90 68.4 49.1 28 5 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 13 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 4 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 0 1 7* 6 0 12 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 50.8 17 6 2 5* 1 0 15 0 99 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	85	85.0	53.4	3	3	3	1*	5	1	1	18	0
88 61.8 51.7 28 11 8* 0 0 0 10 0 0 89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 68.4 49.1 28 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 1 2 5 0 13 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 94 73.8 50.4 17 2 5* 5 5 0 13 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.8 50.8 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.8 50.8 17 5 88 1 4 1 0 15 0	86	65.3	46.8	41	The state of the second	5 . : " / "	3	٠ <u>٠</u>	12*	0.	•	•
89 61.1 46.3 55 4 16* 0 0 0 9 0 9 0 9 0 68.4 49.1 28 28 3* 0 14 0 9 1 76.7 51.9 10 \$ 5 2 3* 0 14 0 9 9 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 9 9 68.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 9 9 7 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 9 9 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	87	62-4	51.4	28	(0	8*	3	6	. 0	12	O,
90 68 4 2 2 3 4 0 14 0 92 61 0 93 7 10 3 7 2 5 7 0 15 0 93 68 7 48 0 31 3 1 9 2 0 14 0 95 69 3 52 1 14 4 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 69 3 52 1 14 4 6 6 2 2 0 15 0 97 66 8 51 9 17 1 5 8 6 3 0 14 0 98 71 6 50 8 17 6 2 8 8 1 4 1 0 15 0 99 71 6 47 9 28 8 1 4 1 0 15 0	88	61.8	51.7	28		managa dana terdesi	8******	0	Q	0 **		()
91 76.7 51.9 10 5 5 2 3* 0 14 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 15 0 0 0 15 0 0 0 0	89	61.1	46.3	55		4 1	6*	0	0 .	0	9	0
91 76.7 51.9 10 3 5 2 3* 0 14 0 92 61.0 53.7 10 3* 4 2 5 0 13 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 68.1 50.1 24 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0				ti v. esta unacampanta 26	n programme de la composition de composition de la composition della composition del	3 a ke officija samo s ec	PARTIES AND AS OF PER	la.go. carras propaga	8* ··· ·	THE TOTAL CHIE.	rkening special property and	CARLOS DOS COSTO PERSONAL
92 61.0 53.7 10 3*** 2 5 0 13 0 93 68.7 48.0 31 3 1 9* 2 0 14 0 95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 95 68.1 50.1 24 0 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 50.8 17 6 2 5* 1 0 15 0 99 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0	4		51.9	10	,	3	5	2	3*	0 ·	14	. 0
93				10	varo-tadaum "va a . in in a milas, des la Mened	3*****	Property of all parity and see	2	5	O ************************************	,15	0
95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15 0 15				31		3	1	9#	2	0	14	0
95 69.3 52.1 14 4* 6 2 2 0 15 0 96 97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 50.8 17 6 2 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0			the state of the s		era ti i ringsuna iz ipinastiraddgi, i i iya vaybanqa çal	Paspalarica truesilarana	5****	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	5		13	···· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
96 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				14	•	4*	6	2	2	0	15	. 0
97 66.8 51.9 17 1 5* 6 3 0 14 0 98 71.6 50.8 17 6 2 5* 1 0 15 0 99 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0		•		escus pear orabetanas de modal estudio	tiski (distra ustikaci e a dad aptiminang citis bilandis distanta ben	Chimelania e dinesa	nya Bara, talan dana terbahkan yan sebiah	et The sound	n'n Qu er same	en emplor Quit w	Clausens	arani en i ur unas 🕻 ina
98 71.8 50.8 17 6 2 5* 1 0 15 0 99 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0				17		1	5*	6	"3	0	14	0
99 71.6 47.9 28 8* 1 4 1 0 15 0				, car specific and range constants	e	 6	. 2	5**************************************	1	0		
				28		8*	1	4	1	0	7.0	0
					a ""			3	0	··· 1		
	सरका पुरा विश्वति	+ + u		-		- .	•	•		•	,	

MEAN P = MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM

MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM

PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING ITEM



A CHAPTON		ISTERED	de la servicio de la companya de la servicio de la companya de la	Witnester, Springer inchigence of the Control of th	E Paris Line Control	THE THE SHE SENDONE STREET	ESPANSAMENTE AV. A. 1434-04	networks/7% of	•	•
reh	MEAN P	HEAN F	PETER	CHO	B	C	D .	E	DK	OMIT
01	63.8	49.5	. 34	2	2	(3)	1	10*	14	d
02	54.6	55.4	69	veranisti bi prazi gladivi koli - ratap kalendaria (militari koli koli prazi i fili koli koli koli koli koli k 6	20*	. 0	Ö	O	3	Ċ
03	59.5	52.5	28	16	8*	0.	0	0	5	C
04	52.4	55.1	ya ing Calendar nancinakada di patri filikaraktar (a	. TO	an manager of the Constitution of	0	0	Ō	12	
05	59.2	49.4	52	15*	4	O			10	
06	62.9	47.6	45	13*	6	0 ,	0	0.	10	
07	63.1	51.1	· 26	12.			0 3*	13	11	
08	82.7	51.2	10	0	0 3*	~ ~	್ಷ 1	4	15	Ì
09 10	87.7 59.8	50.6	1. O	manifored (ventilement over and any and any or e.g.) by	The second se	THE STREET OF THE STREET A	ios talias platais (Say a Jacoba)	madauta marini		
11	59.4	52.6	28	11	Č	1	8*	Ō	9	i
12	59.7	45.6	62		18*	man capanican la Troman Compather	2	O'	7	# (p. 1 H
13	85.0	53-4	3	3	O	1 .	1.0	, 0	24	
14	58.3	44.4	72	21*	a, are, parterioran del greco de del corre	O	0	O	4	- ' '
15	58.3	45.9	69	20*	ots - werkanisment believe and one see	O STATE OF THE STA	O		2	р., ј
16	57.0	32.1	48	14	11	0	0	0	* **	
17	6448	47.2	in an marin and a discount and the second of	and the second s	on C		12*	0	15	e programme de la companya de la com
18	58.7	43.2	72 52	210	3 15*	6	3	0	<i>⊋</i>	
19 20	59.5 67.3	49.0	. 72°. 	A STATE OF THE STA	8*	0	an managan dia sama	Ŏ	12	
20 21	66.7	53.0	10	100	2	3*	4	ŏ	10	
22		49 . 2	Constitute Completely and Constitution	To see M. to the Company of the Adelphane Manual States	na na sipira 😈 👵	Annanthi Pray Ballandia	174	reds.co.usathresideres in s	2	1934
23	58.3	52.4	34	10*	C	. 0	1	2.	16	
24	71.4	49.0	24		Carean anna	1034. 7 S 0151		0	12	•
25	57.8	52.7	34	10*	Laurence and Laurence and 1	2	1	0	15	•
2 6	78.7	46.7		as a fill and an imple Privation one an imple fill and the design		3	2	0	14	
27	57.4	47.48	S. S	and the second state of the second se	\$ 0+	An ecus about a page a com strain	· O	SAGATINA (SAGASA)	- marine en e	Arriger o dans
28	ALL AND ALL AN	52.8	1.5		O	4	10	2	47	
29 30	51-7	54.8	10	34			LU COMMUNICATION OF THE		18	* *
30 31	66.8 73.0	49.0 51.5	20		₩ 4 *	0	5	ŏ	20	
32	72.3	49.8	21		America (A. America)	·	115035 14 17 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	Ŏ.	9	16 × × *
33	63.5	49.7	34	Ğ	3	3	10*	0	13	•
34	46.7	55.3	in the Diffe of the property of the motion was	CATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE STANDARD PARTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PARTY.	PERSONAL MANNESS AFT (C.)	mare manyaran Sime assess	MARKET III MARKETA	3*	17	
35	68.6	51.5	17	C	1	1 .	5*	1	w 21	
36	67-8	51.0	21	y and consign appears characters between the control of the contro	0	I	4	Ö	18	
37	0.0	54.4	1	6	Eus résidéntalementent en ci	()*	<u>6</u>	0	17	
38	76.0	52.0	10	1	1	2	3*	0	22	
39	e and the second	50.2	enezwanienia. Harimwani Artika menia	Q	PRINCES CONTRACTOR PROPERTY CONTRACTOR CONTR	O and Charge American Experience	ACT ST SECRETARISM ACT ST SECRETARISM ACT ST SECRETARISM ACT S	AND STREET OF THE PROPERTY OF	Ol	
40	The Period Market Control of the Con	54.9	anther words . Springer and a section		5	1	0*	0	. 17	
41 42	0.0	54.4 54.4	tonings sale (a) seems of a hardwar typestate and	ary interest and artificial community and the amount of the community of t	and which strandstrands on the	nerenne sparing e better	2		16	
43	56.8	54.0	17	á	5*	ō	ō	Ö	. 16	
44	51.2	56.4	ar par de arrango paro é en el te comunicación de de Se de Grando en des	arisa a manufaction of the property of the same all the same and the s		11*	5 th	0	4	r rate o mili
45	53.8	60.3	90	Ò	264	. 2	1	0	0	
46	restriction on 59 miles to the	**************************************	School of the State of the Stat	antimitativitania arre independe arranging products	Summer Committee	7.74	Contract of the Contract of th	CONTRACTOR OF STATES	of a substant to see the	AMARITAN GILLA 16
47	66.5	47-1	38	• 0	2	11*	• 💆	0	8	h váskutství – 12 km. – A
48	70.0	53.9	umana za ar- da barsar sari ir varamatelasin yaqibi (med biblishishi si	Control of the second s	A THE STREET WAS A STREET WAS A STREET	T.	Ō	0	27	
49	58.6	53.1	124	8	2	7*	7	0.	5	

MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM

PCT P - TOTAL PERCENT PASSING ITEM

^{+ -} CORRECT CHOICE

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND PRE-TEST ADMINISTERED, JULY 7, 1969

ITEM	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCTP	CHU	ICE	ir igkid ga d'arr'annyan sambawaha'				
	. 4	•		A	B	C	C	E	DK	OMIT
151	70.0	52.0	14	C	0	4*	1	8	16	O
152	62.7	49.4		6		11*	3	O	5	0
153	68.2	51.6	17	5*	3	2	5	0	14	, 0
154	62.0	50.5	34	in the state of th	10*	1 1	5	0	6	. 0
155	57.3	48.0	69	• 0	C	0	20*	0	9	0
156	58.5	52.3	34	10*	3		1	8		0
157	60.6	50 - 1	41	1	12*	0	O material	1	17	0
158	0.0	54.4	1	0	Ī	1	0*	0	21	0
159	73.7	52.2	10	3*	.2	3		U O	19	. 0
160	0.0	54.4	T		8	ω, Ο, .	U	0	21	U,

MEAN P - MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM

MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM

PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING TIEM

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESTING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND PRE-TEST ADMINISTERED JULY 7,1969

MEAN=	54.448	SD= 17	.997 N=	29 RANG	E= 20- 95	e and the second of
SCORE	z sco.	TR-SCO.	FREQ.	PCT.	ONE * =	1
20	-1.91	308.59	1	3	*	•
21	-1.86		, (m²/m²) (m²/m²) (m²/m²)		inga kafat na interna na pisawa katawa ka na interna na na na	•
22	-1.80	319.70	0	3	A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF TH	
23	-1.75	325.26	1	7	, *	
24	-1.69		. 0	o and the second of the second	ym a r y trong t	
25	-1.64 -1.58		O C	7	*	
26 27	-1.53	16.0		ra missa mara kan da <mark>kan katan m</mark> arahar mata m	And the second s	
28.			ŏ	7	*	•
29	-1.41		C	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	***************************************	• • •
30	-1.36		C	7	*	
31	-1.30	369.71	0	The second secon	And the second section of the second	
32	-1.25		0	7	A STANDARD OF THE STANDARD SOURCE OF	End Francisco and Company and Company
33	-1.19		C			,
34	-1.14		O	7	The second secon	and the second of the second
35	-1.08		0	7	*	
36	+1.03		1.4 0 	e ser en	and the second s	g to Strange to the second of
37 38	-0.97 -0.91		Ů,	7	*	
39	-0.86		and the second second	14	**	and the second second
40	-0.80		ĩ	17	*	
41	-0.75	and the second s	. 1	21	*	•
42	-0.69		1	24	*	
43	-0.64	436.39	C	24	*	
. 44	-0.58	441.94	2	31	**	
45	-0.52		2 .	38	**	
46	···O-47	***************************************	0	38	**************************************	*
4.7	-0.41		1	41	# ***	
48	-0.36 -0.30		& 	48	The second secon	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
49 50	-0.25		0	48	*	
51	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		in in the contract of the cont	55 · · ·	Cartist the second section of the second section is a second	and the second
52	-0.14		· 1	59	*	
53				59	A STATE OF THE STA	
54	-0.02	497,51	O	59	*	
55	0.03	503.07	O	59	and the second s	and the second s
56	0.09		C	59	a diciolate des relativos des como	and the second second
57	0.14		1	62	*	
58	0 - 20		La en es esception	66	en de 🕶 Georgia 📥 Karles en	
59	0 - 25		0	66	*	
60	0.31 0.36			·············69		****
62			Ĉ	69	*	
63			Caral - Velkhandki kelländiberiat (k.c.)	time in our 72	a stance of authorization of the second seco	gradin televak dakid da
64			ō	72	*	•
65			r () igo ga () operatorija samo secili et objeti samber	72	u dadaya yananarak e sirii	in the control of the second of the control of the
66	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	i.	1	76	*	
5 67	0.70			79	ergania i suprai area fanta parte de de estado do esta en el	rempediak arrapugus kike hilide ili di i B
68				79	A ANDRONO MARKET STATE OF THE S	والمعارف والمستودي والمتكاول والمستوار الأداء العامان
59		and the second of the second o		ешнорных пись так жарт у ранноры кылы	**	
70	0.84	5 586.41	Z	86	and a supplementage of the state of the section of	e make de 'n 'n beske op helden her helde (de bekansje - o - 14 hets
ى ئۇدىلىقىدىن ئورىنىكىيىنىڭ ئېزىكى ئۇدىلىقىدىن ئىسىدىكى ئېزىكى ئۇدىلىقىدىن ئىسىدىكى ئېزىكى ئېزىكى ئېزىكى ئېزىك ئىرىنىڭ ئارىكى ئارى	gram ymir dein. E'n dwyn padairyfydin grydnifell a cafeldawdu y glaidy	*	•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESTING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND PRE-TEST ADMINISTERED JULY 7, 1969

•	MEAN=	54.448	SO= 1	7.997 N#	29	RANGE=	20-	95		
٠,,,	SCORE	Z SCO.	TR-SCO.	FREQ.	PCT.	ng at to y a did ipling ya adalahilakan menuturkanya yais i	ONE .	= 1	Aparahandarah undi kayinganinga saya iyoya s-ab	an ad fan 'e de de Aramad an man de dade de engendag ing
	71	0.92	591.97	0	86	· Arrived 41 for controlled and	ه جوهبان ها دو هنده و هنده هنده و	a di militira salanga , di ayah Sangainggay pinag a 194 ya	a Partish addir Amerikasiyanin adi. 311	स्वयंत्रकालाम् वर्षः १०० वर्षः वर्षः वर्षः ४ वर्षः १ वर्षः १ वर्षः १ वर्षः १ वर्षः १ वर्षः १ वर्षः । वर्षः १ व १
a irdan pr	72	0.98	597.52	TOTAL AND	d Branchine market	MESHWITE STORESTHAND	American and Arthrophysics	11678 Care of Expenditures 211111	t feitheach, mhistibhis (mhtsifa bhe thàid	ndaturadisərə ələbəsi karakçıyı, gərələ Kreykkuşıyı,
•	73	1.03			86	• • •	• ;			
••	74	1.09	608.64	- ····································	86	enrefrir e wederforret kombetane 🛊	Carlogates in grantificities conscious expression	de militatepesa en 11 mais (1 ma se 140	وراي مع موسوعية إن أو معود من أنه الله الله الله الله الله الله الله ال	ne manamente commerce que majo la residima - en strato effican returna d
	75	1-14	614.19		86	er, jedan 🖟		•	•	
,	75	1-20	619.75		86	Complete Section Secti	profity year state it is to proceed or consisted by the	برنفيطين ويوجون دواو والموجود ووالد بالكافيان	nd. Danista yang di angan dinakan katalong di danista d	endrante datuje tina odata seelik bosibi ya ga aya yi hide i new 1 sel (see iki) ya -2 aya yibig
••	77.	1.25	625.31	0	86					•
	78	T. T.	630.86	 .	70	Wall-chap Chapter of the Control of	entantina de la colonia de la companya de	AND A THE PARTY AND A PARTY OF THE PARTY OF	44.12 - 12.14 2-730-114-144-144	The state of the s
	79	1.36	636.42		90		F.,	•		
,	80	1.42	641.98	, 77 *	90	Managa i di di Sangga pangkada na i 19 dangga pangkada na i 19 dangga pangkada na i 19 dangga pangkada na i 19	grandersen en e		of the mainly of sold or the adjoint, in the or is sold of	يوندو و فيديوندي يوروندي موسول موسول الموسول الموسول الموسول الموسول الموسول الموسول الموسول و الموسول
******	81 :	1.43	647.53	, -	90		!			•
	82	1.53	653-09		90	•	g / EE b all att a All Excess a y Admiller tecomocràtique	و هواه د همو د ملها یا شار یو. ای های دهد است. او های ا	Hara - de material de la chientama de - desti	P normal sur- managal politica de la casa (2012) esta managal para esta de la casa (2012). Esta de la casa (2012)
	83	1.59	658.65	•	90		!		:	
	84	T.64	664.20		O Promote income	•	an estificat services y year form acquaint	idistronasion assertionalactionis.	eisenskalelmannen i zua araziitz	mijan Suntaani Kahaniganinganan Karalis (1976) (1994) (1994)
	85	1.70	669.76	1	73			•		,
	756	2.75	675.31		93		grafia di kanada da k Kanada da kanada da k	habiph Mililian an ion beres ben e	erk renskonfoldelmedral sen i sy probler e	Hercumenta in the cooper of the cooperation of the
	87	1.81	680.87	•	93	, ,				
	88	1.86	686.43	C	7 93		promoter trem to the second se	ost i m i mikstr i srdfannassotifostai. E ar	 To be produced to the property of a data and the condition of the condition of	Mir. A
, .	···· 4.90°	1.92	691.98	0	. 93		The second	•		
	91	1598	697.54		are a seemander of the		tan dan mengentah dan mengentah dan	tirak direk pulan akadan akada a	Alia تكسفرونغ وزياق فليسام فينطاع فرطائي .	dedos sudos como un del del del relativo el modul deliberado. Se
		2-03	703.10		37			¥* 1.		
	92 93	2.09	708.65	200		11 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		· serve on examination age	agentus a specific of the party and the	gallanuassa a er - deutssangsgradt av styr. g p
		2.14	714.21	<u> </u>	97	9.8		A STATE OF THE STA		
	94"	2.20	719.77	1	97	r Dia	The second secon	rangian pagapapananan pagapa Bigitan Bigitan Bigitan Bigitan Bigitan	ndjhalagi a ar 1600 i dhaq qaqa i sayd a	room er vom is im rennemen i olik olimalise maak en Elisa
ire da	. TD' W. Har wordstreen and M.	ES & S	725.32	The Disk of	100			property and might on payment days on a tent of the	• 4 •	The statement of the state
			•		THE STATE OF THE S		A CALL CONTRACTOR OF A SAME AND A SAME AND A SAME AND ASSAULT OF A SAME AND ASSAULT OF A SAME AND ASSAULT OF A	ter grande (1914) deut des proprietes (1914) de proprietes (1914) de proprietes (1914) de proprietes (1914) de La companya (1914) de proprietes (1914) de pr	MANAGERALE CAR MANAGERAGIA	n, esq. de procedimentos matematicas en consciente de la for

ERIC PRINTER PROVIDED BY ERIC

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND
PRE-TEST ADMINISTERED JULY 7-1969

PRE-TEST ADMIN	ISTERED	JULY		The state of the state of the same	
STUDENT NAM	E	SCORE			AT SOME
ABBOTT DOUGE	LAS W	78	90 7	631.	1.31
APT FRED	ER ICS	40	The second secon	420.	-0.80
BARNES EVER	ETT W	39	in ingres i reservado de estado de estad Estado estado en est	414.	-0-86
CAMERON PHIL	IP J	45	38 4	448.	-0.52
COGAN RICH	ARD W	70	makaraki saha, sa-asia kacada kasar inga aray sarati-sa-ara da na gyarawa. BBB	586 4	0.86
DARLING SCOTT	Paul Control of the C	58	and the state of the	S20 a	6.20
DIXON R ALPI	H E	de madespir. Tan fregue agus e emple (qui e ar		459	-0.41
EMILI Q ANN	ם	39	The state of the s	4145	-0.86
EVANS NORM	AN	6 1 6 1	оонилистия чанным и того в тарфоно в того мого зого стала стой и в бого и на в того и на в того и на в того и н	A in the the approximation of the state of t	0.36
FEUERSTEIN MART	M	52	59	486 .	-0.14
GRAHAM CONR	AD	31	**************************************	481.	-0.19
GRODINSKY HAROI	LD M	66°	э орин макенийн оороноорийн авааса ээгэ оолоо илтуу оо и	7 5 4 diamental distribution of the second o	0 + 64
HACKETT FRAN	CIS	48		464.	-0.36
HARNOTS HERM	AN A	45	38 4	448.	-0.52
HOKANS CORE	YN.	85	The second secon	ii - Me Challagarun dan Araba mengabun mengabun berapat	1570
LANCE W'TLE	TAH	20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	309.	-1.91
LEWIS GEOR	GE	52	24 3	431.	-0.69
MACFARLANE JAME	S W	63 minutes	eri jaakside suosiisiiden – sikkilaaja ja	548	0.48
MARSTON CHAR	LES	67	Anna Caranta de Antonio de Antonio de Caranta de Carant	570.	0.70
MURDDCK	N D	sue foliamente : à promiser de partir de la grad deserve	<u> </u>	4253	-0.75
OS BORNE DOUG	LAS	an road - a asan ng sa sa sa sa mas ad	ii transmuunintasuuksivisti konstaati ka paattusa 11 siita 174 Anta 1793	a residentia de la compania del compania de la compania del compania de la compania del la compania de la compania dela compania del la compa	r disso filosof segularidad di segulari pesara (disebbi) seg
PHAUP PATR	TCK W	23	A CHARLEST BE AND REBLIE COMMANDAMENTAL OF COMMANDAMENT C	325 .	-1275
POIRIER ROBE	RT	and a sate processor of subsequences and a subsequence of the	ipie de courrende mandriant de la propriée de la p	542	-0-58
POPLAWSKI EUGE	NE	Meaning Aneral Constitution	stacia uncontroppe a medicina de la compansión de la comp	energy recording to a Stable Communication of the C	transmire On the Co
RICE ROBE	RT	95.	100	725.	2.25
ROYA	ANN	arver arrein to hadronian State of a very first of a	and the second of the property property of the second seco	ym i gaeth i gannathaidh ann an tagairt ag a' gaeth ag a' ann an tagairt ag a' ann an tagairt ag a' ann an tag	40-19
is in the second	Andrew Andrew States - Live - Land States	crision na agus michine leith air dagu Cunain air ann 1721.	ora. Ilo m (enparta faviralista, apriloùvia, la partambre el pie	o e que que la que en esta en esta en esta en	. T.e. est. delegrada por describent describina de estimator que pa
on the control water the control of the property of the control of	-	hermanian in a part of the straight and		ا) ساق اختىمادارالماندالمانديغادولۇرىك يالدوغا مېسىندىرىدا - دەرىمىد مىدارى و	k B gandderdge gi <u>rd d</u> endagen od and dendelender pelekter den er er er en de skrivet gener en den den den den den de

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND PRE-TEST ADMINISTERED JULY 7,1969 STUDENT NAME SCORE PCT.RANK STA STD.SCORE Z-SCORE SIMPSON VELMA 48 464 .. 48 5 -0.36 LESTER TOMKINSON 44 442. 31 EDWARD WINSLOW 90 698. 97 · 8 1.98

TEM	TEST ADM	MEAN F	AUGUSY 15		CE				r	
. See 3 9	,	Park to add to the control of the	united the state of the state o		_	AND MORE THE THERETE		L, CANDERSONS	DK. O	LIL
1	90 .6.	85.4	41	7	4	12*	6	0	Q	(
. <u>L</u>	88.5	85.8	66	6 .	1	3	19*	0	ð	(
L. *3		91.4	31	9*	<u>.</u>	2	14	Ô	0	(
<i>5</i>	79.0		*	and the second state of the second se	2.	8	12*	Ö	0	(
4	92.5	84.1	41		e. L	atarana and an an a	23*	Ŏ.	Õ	. (
. >	90.7	antina na managa and and an		za za prezionalista de la composición	TOLER VERTER PROPERTY AND	aterainiaakaaseti. e O .	e i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Maria Maria Salat (N ()	O	, î
5	88.6	81.3	86	25*	11	0.	1	ŏ	.0	Ì
7.	94.2	78.1		1.7*	and the second s		and the same of the same	0	0 '	
B	89.8	84.4	59	1	8	17*) 1	0	ň	,
9	88.1	80.5		27*			100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100	W	0	.
10	98.9	82.4	31	0	9*	13	<i>[</i>	0	0	`
11	89 . 6	63.7	66	and the second of the second o	1.9*	grane Darret	a managara	ii 24 kaniin Marki wanii	napage of a Mary class of the	
12	90.7	81.5	66	5	19*	4	1	0	0	
13	86.6	87.9	24		19		7*	<u> </u>	y Access Comprehensive	
14	91.0	79.9	69	7	2	20*	0	0	0	(
15	97.6	81,4	38	11*	<u> </u>	12	6	0		
16	91.3	75.9	76	22*	1	2	4	, 0	Ŭ	(
17	98.0	85.4	17	S\$	TERRETARING AND A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE	a managa a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	La L	nea . E inalia de maria	eo anta no mandi di d	. Braise
18	95.0	83.6	34	3	. 1	10*	15	0	0	(
19	87.8	81.0	97	O	0	<u> </u>	, suprantistation in the service and service	28*		
20	84.8	89.5	41	12*	1.0	5	2	0	O .	(
21	88.3	87.0	41	12*	9	6	2	0	0	na a diberra
22	101.7	83.0	24	16	maan oo ah	5	7*	0	0	
		,	51	12*	Ô	0	5	3	O	
23	89.3	86,3		AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF THE PART	94	nirayancadar Columbiana 3	<u>Perus. Progresia Consuspaciones</u> ()	0	Ö	1141 W. M. 144
24	95.0	84.2	31	2	5	1	21*	Ŏ	õ	
25	89.0	83.9	72	0	ii iii ka ii ii ka i	6*	9	8		المسورين
26	88.5	87.3	21		4	2	18*	1	ŏ	
27	89.6	84.2	62	2	<u> 6</u>	2	22*	0	0	
28	87.0	89.3	76	U	5		3	0	Ô	
29	90.8	72.2		STERRE : E PERFERENCIA PAR LA SER DE COMBESSION DE L'ARGE	and the second second	24*	and the second section of the sectio	.ess zasternickýc akto e+ik-t	is and dispublished bulges the every	e vwast
30	89.6	75.0	86	25*	3	0	1	. 0	_	
31	92.8	32.7	48	3	14*		10		0	• • •
32	88.8	86.9	34	3	10*	16	0	Ö	0	
33	87.4	88.5	86		£ 0	25*	and the same of th			٠٠٠٠ و مر مم
34	89.2	79.6	83	24*	5	0	0	0	0	
35	89.6	75.0	86	TO THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO	armace becomb listers 4	Q	ar de madramente aprendente e re	oonaana Qoraano	entra de la companya	edo e 14
36	84.0	88.0	10	23	3*	2	1	0	0	
37	32.8	88.8	21	19	2	6*		Q		****
38	96.0	81.6	41	12*	1	4 %	. 12	0	, 0	
39	95.2	85.6	21	6*	3		16	<u>Q</u>	Marria Commission Comm	·
40	89.9	86.7	28	13	2	6	8*	0	0	
41	94.7	80.9	48	2	14*	9	and the states of the states o	O CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	L. to the residence of the constant.	see at
42	91.4	82.8	.m. i mai isaaninaaninka kan kan kan kan kan kan kan kan kan	us y zak program (1997) kram u stanece i na Polinina Homes i sa O	13	O STATES	16*	0	0	
43	93.6	78.9	59	ŏ	9	2	17*	1	0	
44	91.4	80.3	66	19#	. 9	1	0	Q	0	
-		83.0	90	ó	ó	26*	3	0	0	
45	88.1		90	and stated a series and an action of security to the second secon	26*	2	0	0	0	- wester - 1
46	90.2	64.3		i i	بر م ر	1	Ö	27*	Ŏ	
47	89.1	66.5	0 200 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 0	and the about the part of the control of the contro	inganak mengali 🖅 - : - ses	LERTENGENER HUTTER D.	ora o oraș a marinamento. 4		er er voor Teanmen water. An	6.1
48	89.4	85.6	52	15*	8	4*	0	Ö	ň	•
49	99.8	85.6	14	14	11	وعوجه الانتهاب بأواح زقارته يصفونا بين وارجه عامدته	etin in er skiller kalliforese mense	0	0	
50	87.3	87.7	41	7	12#	10	0	Ū	U	

MEAN P = MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM

MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM
PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING ITEM

	TEST ADI	4 IN ISTERED	AUGUST 1	Lum Changi 5-1969		S A SI		1017E		
1 7 EM	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCT P	t samement that he terms a toward a name for the	CE		Carried to a place to the state of the property of	TULVE	nd a - Crappilprocrate and service	eun in der Moydern in in desemble seen verschieden von der
etorano o posici	. Over the case of	eti eti kiti perijettiri ji. Adelah suferin kuta tu sitistika ili kutusi.	i Nagaring al-minamenkalpaka, vajam menga sebingala	os compressioner and and a con-	ers aquipes a milionese.	nedas pure que de la compación de pare	D Participal de la Company de La Company de la Company de	Carre a main Monthern of	DK	OMIT
51	90.0	83.5	62	6	5	18*	.0	0	0	0
52	90.2	83.2	62	1 5*	6	5	0	O	0	The served Political Strategy and American Control of C
53.	686.9	The second secon	38	The contract of the contract o		11*	11	Ó	0	0
54	91.0	82.7	59	6	2	0	4	17*	Ø	0
55	89.0	and appear to the survey of the state of the	commingent more and the second second	25#	. Unit desergence encourage inter	BELLEVIS (S. A. S. A		manneaurassinistinistik kompransistik	MATSURANCE AND AND A	CONTRACTOR IN THE STREET OF THE STREET
56 57	90.4	85.8	38	18	11*	0	0,	. 0	0	0
58	93.8 88.9	79.0		5. The section of the		16*		Andrew Company of the		
5 9	90.5	83.4	59	274	2 17*	6	0	O O	0	. 0
60	90.6	79.6		or, and annual test asserts an assessment between a strainfunction about the second section of the sectio		21#	enderen begoeke syldespeter op begoeke felbandiplansker gesam 6 Mere begoeke syldespeter op begoeke felbandiplansker gesam 6		<u>-</u>	
61	102.6	80.8	31	ó	ž	2	9*	14		ñ
62	100.6	84.8	кого подак маракомом подом в погращения доступа.	n i rasaminarjindadhinardhinanggari arancinishinin LL	T	erzenna Karzenna G #	1 T	n avenemeternetikkenskerneter L		O CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR
63	95.8	82.5	38	11*	3	8	7	Ö	Ō	Ŏ
64	85.5	39.7	52	3	15*	9	2	O C	0	0
65	99.5	81.3	B4.	2.	. 6	10	1	10*	0	0
65	89.9	67.0	90	O	2	26*	0	1	0	0
<u>67</u>			na armanan nagarin nasarin	Anno ammerica programa productiva	23*	is discount of the second	CANADA MANAGARA ANA	PROFESSION EX CAMPAGNACIA	0	O HARACO DE LA LA CALLANDA DE LA CAL
68 69	88.7	86.2	55 36	164	7	, ()	4	2	O	0
70	97.4 93.5	83.8 83.9		To the second of	100 Z	8**		16	0	<u></u>
71	93.2	72.6	38	114	5	16 0	0 21*	0	0	0
· Andrews Williams Commission (1888)	91.5	78.8	consequent to the second secon	morning on a manufacture of the fore	AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	20*	ACCOUNTS OF THE PARTY OF THE PA	<u> </u>	Ŏ	tuniant an immon te afanan an
73	99.4	63.0	92.		27	Ö	1	Ŏ	ŏ	0
74	93.2	75.0	63	20	Comments of the contract of th	5	***************************************	O	0	AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER
75	98.3	79.9	41	enter de enterior de la companya de		12*	3	0	0	0
76	95.0	80.9	49	1.	0	13*	2	. 0	, Ø.	0
	89.2	86.7	Additional and Property . 344 and Jacquesters.	100		0 1	3/1	10	. 0	
70	92.8	81.1	95	4	1.6*	4	5	Ø.	• • • • •	0
	91.6	THE THE STREET AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT	The state of the s	of the second supportation of the second second second	eres errorrentementementementementementementement	24*	T	enderandere O	0	MEZHENIZATEZIĞI AZARHANDA KAMPAN MAÇA
80 81	90.7 93.9	86.1 75.4	31	94	2	17	1.	0	0	0
82	86.4	88.6	65 48	1.2*	2 3	2	6 14*	L TIZO LUMANUM AND	······································	
83	87.2	97.0	97	12	8	*	28*	0	ď	0.
84	87.2	89.0	nan managan na pangka kitali ping pangka na managan na kataling pangka na pangka na pangka na pangka na pangka 199	Altered to the second	23*		moch desiration of the second second	a tumundi waxanaki dayaa - cifuqisi -niin	<u></u>	
85	94.5	84.9	28		8*	15	4	ĭ	Ŏ	ŏ
86	90.1	65°5	es e establica de la composition de la	Will the world and consider and another and an account	energystapaceaticabilities prose	0	14*	SELVE AL, IA ATTAMA GARALEMAN ESSAGA.	, O.	O SECURIO DE PARTICION DE LA CONTRACTION DE LA C
67	88.6	85.1	69	2	20*	6	1	.0	0	0
88	88.2	86.8	55	13	16#	0	O	0	, 0	0
89	90.6	80.8	69	g.	20*	O .	0	O	0	O
90	94.8	84-3	31	11	3	4	9*	-2	0	, 0
91	83.0	annatuleringan period selection en en annature proposer com	ottanasinininininininininininininininininin	-William Carlotte Company of the Carlotte Company of t	13		2*	Lateral Annual Control of the Control	0	CONTRACTOR LEGGE CONTRACTOR
93	86.6 95.8	86.4 81.8	48 41	14*	7	3 12*	5 3	0	0	0
94	103.2	83.5	21.	10	6 *				<u>0</u>	0
95	101.4	83.1	24	74	8	11	3	Ö	, 0	ő
96	92.1	84.4	appearantement are appearant management of the property of the second of	nd tile, have ger som som som en i benøgen sindere springer, men skielen ere er er i e	Carabia di Maza antara di Maria di Antara	12*	9	and the second section of the	Ŏ	, <u>0</u>
97	90.6	86.9	17	7	5*	- 13	4	Ö	Ŏ	ŏ
96	93.3	80.5	55	nti sicocomo instansita antinggili sulas malaminicas m	eranen zotungen eranen betrauten bosten eranta. L	16*	3	de ser la comunidad proprieta de consulta	0	The state of the s
99	89.5	78.C 86.7	83	24*	2	0 -	3	0	0	C
100	91.6		, 17	13	5*	9	2		0	

MEAN P = MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM

MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM
PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING ITEM



OST-		IN ISTERED	AUGUST 15	•	•	23	x	IULCE	** TOP - ** - *	
TEM	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCT P		ICE					
. 2762	e e Seekel oo y saa	9 Model Williams	and the parties of the second second second	suarcustomics (s. A.) sous s	a a Bangan	, .C	D	E	DK	OM
01	87.8	87.1	62	5	•	. 2 .	3.	18*	0	
02	87.9	86.4	76		22*		<i>3</i> .	0 10*	<u>0</u>	
03	93.8	85.2	28	21	8*	Q.	0	0	^	
)4	87.4	87.6	34	19	10*	0		0	. U.	
)5	90.0	81.0	72	21*	8	0	0	0	0	
)6	86.8	89.9	76	22*	::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	0		 O		
7	88.6	86.5	48	15	14*	0	0	0	0	
8	75.6	. 90.0	17		0		5*	20	.0	
)9	99.0	83.9	24	1	7*	11	2	.9	. 0	
LO	93.6	82.6	45	13		ed a maid on the list Black constitution in large la	0,			•
	86.0	88.8		13	T.	13* 2	13*	2	0	
2	87.6	87.0		in a arthur William ann an Aireann an	or respublicans	A. 16.1.1,(1)	I.2~	D. W. D. W. D. S. C.	<u>u</u> .	,
13	92,7	84.8	34	U &	28*	0	10*	0	0	
4	89.9	76.4	83		<u>6</u>			<u>Q</u>	V.	
5	87.6	0.0	99	24* 29*	-	Ö	0	0	0	
6	89.6	77.8	83	a the stranger of the product of the party and agreed	0	0	<u></u>	0		
17	88.6	84.9	72	24*	2	0	0	· 0	0	
⊩. €. L.8	88.8		and the second of the second o	atokiminkasista, amagasista kisi, spissisi.	an in the second	zamena kena sa	21*		0	
9	91.3	81.8	83	24*	5	0	.0	0	Ö	
50		81.4	62		18*	10		0	Q	•-
	92.8	83.3	45	0	13*	4	12	0	U	
?1 ?2	95.6	83.3	34	12	4	10*	3		Q.	
	87.8	86.0	. 86	2	0	2	25*	0	0	
23	89.3	79.4	83		a management				<u>Q</u>	
24 25	87.9 89.6	87.4	31	2	. 10	9*	8	Ö	Ö	
26		79.7	79	23*				<u></u>	<u>Q</u> .	
27	95.3	78.1	55 76	5	16*	Ţ	. (0	Ü	
	89.6	81.1	The state of the s	Car Landa Carlo	55*	<u>Q</u>	0		9	
28	90.5	82.7	62	18*	4	2	5	0	0	
22	95.3.	83.5	commination of the contraction o	10*	r intermedia (Marie 1977)	a Quantita	17	<u>Q</u>	9	
30	91.8	78.1	69	ı.	6	20*	2	0	0	
31	93.2	78.3	62	4	1.8*	3	👲	0	. 0	
32	91.2	81.5	62	18*	1	3	7	0	0	
33	94.5	77.7	59		. Z	. where it is taken a line of the con-	17*	0	. 0	
34	90.9	86.3	28	4	1	4	12	8*	0	
35	91.9	86.2			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		7*	💮 🥞 . 🥹 C	: 	
36	89.6	60.0	93	27*	1	1	0	0	0	
17	93.1	83.6	41		<u>Q</u>	12*	10	Q 4.	. 0	,
38	93.3	74.9	69	0	4	5	20*	. 0	0	
9	92.3	83.1	48		14#			Q	1	
0	90.1	81.9	69	3	4	. 1	20*	1	0	
Legisland	104.7	1986 Jan 1988 1885 1885 1885 1885 1885 1885 1885	NOW ALL WATERWAY MARKET SECTION OF THE	a w	ц жылыктында жесілді.		4*	A MODE SON COLUMN T	0	. 4
12	93.7	86.0	21	10	11	O	2	6*	O	
3	91.5	85.2	38	18	11*	0	0	<u> </u>	O	
4	90.2	83.3	62	6	1	18*	ፋ	0	0	
5	88.8	53.0	97		28*	0	1	0	0	
6	89.3	82.9	72	6	· 1	21*	1	0	0	
7	93.8	73 - 6	oponisiamenten alba Sicaram com am	PENAL Minard anno Mhrath ag a Tair - 15 - 15 an		20*	5		0	
84	101.1	83.2	24	11	2	7*	9	0	0	
19	95.8	80.9	45	7	5	13*	4	0	0	
50	87.0	92.3	90	2	26*	0	1	0	0	

MEAN P = MEAN OF ALL PASSING ITEM
MEAN F = MEAN OF ALL FAILING ITEM
PCT P = TOTAL PERCENT PASSING ITEM

* - CORRECT CO



	MEAN P	MEAN F	PCT P	CHNT	OMIT A	et i ir — a faari radaris t fa algum ngar	public and the second s	And in the Sandarine open		(a.m. t 5
	education that the transfer	to some support	. the expension where		В	C	D	E	DK	OMI
							THE PERSON NAMED OF THE PE	MARKET CONTRACTOR	5- 16 v - 1 · V - 24 48 1	•
51	91.4	86.3	24		<u> </u>	7*	<u>l</u>	17		
52	92.1	81-1	59	3	5	17*	4	0	0	
	93.7	86.0	21	6*	2	3	18	0	0	
5 5	93.0 87.4	83.1	45	9	13*	, 1	6	0	0	•
	87.9	88.7 87.0	90	s ann ann a deal deal at ann ann an ann an an an an an an an an		<u>0</u> .	26*	<u>I</u>		, , , , , ,
57	88.1	86.6	62 66	18* 4	6 19*	0	1	4	0	
58	96.3	82.9	34		7.34	5		5	0'	· · ·
59	95.2	75.1	62	18*	4	5 5	10* 2	0	0	•
60	89.8	86.5	31	9*	13	<u> </u>	2	0	0	~ · · · · ·
EAN F EAN F PCT P	= MEAN C	OF ALL FA	SSING ITEM ILING ITEM PASSING ITE		g # # # # ******************************	unuasannisis dishusid utabuaris d	ogika miran mandidasis og 1 ga saksallagigs sa 1	hilinger, shed following spade pyraphics	terbah satu saks amerika and	e garrett ar ere eeg
16 Marie and residency of the contract of the	UNNE	J1 0783 20 E	niem rinkfloren wersen er is engensphilipe i sofiel jupindys er	raf aramatik - na kanus planniska plana i ujiman-sisalah (ilidakk nuki	collecture a terebocco pale gal		ggargitalis (film) grilgiph - m righter (il-quis po	a citra gas va da mpatsificatio castinogo	n ingga pan mambaganan yan	g de peque 11 em pi
 18 ∨ Д#ш+гу - 25 шг 	ine - ne e - e fentine la dissabilità i din emegazione i	والمنافقة والمتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة المتحافظة	er francische Steine der Steine S Steine Steine Stein	1997), die englie jungfehrijf brokensterend, brokenste E	ukutu meralan kubbu	على دونا نية بالمستشهدة ، در دون	e jek Walddespenhendika e.	ez engasi-bay pravaria.	there grantings , the aid tool to like a	r o sombler com
	nd o ou la college dans d'a d'orde parabléssée	tion of the consequence of the c	ادري. مامارات الإسام الإسام الاستان ساد ميمونيس	The state of the s	he di mandeterrage met	ji Harinatersi witomorga di ta	g ann pertabbah opi anag baragan	t Branco and complete company of the party of the	ledenje avija segelede ilijajova, "	·* ** * · · · · · · · ·
• .										
	nere en dimenui per con Celo con despresa.	for monthly considerable and a recent of a second of the monthly con-	erando en la facilita deldesa e e delgaritado de la discussión	4 - Company of the second seco		t Stanting van Arturys et dismilier sytuplaciet A	nuridak dikindiyah mi dini. Taiyay	omografy as a substitute of a	More in the cast or object is stopped.	
				3	•	•				
ميوغريگور دا في ريانود،	eta inki akudostintan' pakina ni arrabin probagian inkis j	o Timm i Simboor, affichet titalier i Nordt Station (i.e. i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	do to the manufacture and proceedings of the second second	н — эт бөгүйө таныга ага айга айга айга балгуулган айган.	energistes in socialis. A	, Antonia franciscoscolită, cur ,	وُ فِي مِنْ الْمُعْمِدُونِ مِنْ مُعْمِدُونِ مِنْ الْمُعْمِدُونِ مِنْ مُعْمِدُونِ مِنْ مُعْمِدُ الْمُعْمِدُونِ	disabilia - ani aristologia di	nda anasadahan yang dari da	
,			•	en de la companya de La companya de la co		•				
7 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	r - 1861 - Listo de Sprimero - dese podro dopo de podro de proposicio.	references (elle el der el estados espesivimento y la	and the second section is	The state of the second	Carrier services (no services e	ender en aranamananter e asteriake	B. My range to the reproducts begin seems	r ggirmatik mengelagus rika i	r de de terdese e Sedenario de C	· mt ·
		• •			· · · · ·		•		•	
and the Market of the State of	e itra elektronici i neverani i seckandalim di imadiri. S	o de carriama a de la describa paramera aqua a l'el la lida de la	tanten environe n'ily incepi.	to alone is a serie experience con	إنطاعة غيادا والمسادات	and the residual dead players and the same and	ing transfer of the second sec	ominana militar a rasi ili gilara	ing the companies of the companies of	
r	,					,				
and the second	रामितः । त्रास्त्रक्षेत्रिकेति क्षेत्रिकाः व्यवस्थिति । त्रास्त्र द्वित्रास्य	Turk dalah d	the three leaders of the highest and the events of the tree events and the safe and	бомманыя — в фациары про 1187—118 группуский в друг П	in antonini sarom et iriza ancendenia Li	wither de penerales o cranacas	nder en deservations de la val	auciseals surventum samurus de	epuit vast tilbetstedis att paterey ps	1.4 A
				tale jako kitti. Tilotoo					•	
	The second of th	्राप्ताहरूमा १९६६ । इस में तार्थित होता होते । विदेश प्रमुख क्रमीत प्रेमेंक पूर्वत क्रमान्य क्रमान्य क्रमान्य इस	and the second of the second o	r e r r f e freheggspil plot u	* ***	pr pr. una - cha la fagada a	e estaparago o dessorá	i ese andi geni	r din	
	•									
	ى ئىلىرىكى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرىكى ئىلىرىكى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلىرى ئىلى ئىلىرىكى ئىلىرى ئىل		And the second s						The right of the proof.	de ser es s
	e designer with square transposers and	in the composition of a composition of the composit	The state property of the state	Contract of the second section of the section of th	nki - Mimoscob holy 1416:	k-s, yh. A, abrik-sasakahilisi, . u	real (1) or enrichmed had when the ment and	armanaparati nakersa a		
e de la companya de l	a seeda a saa saa saa saa saa saa saa saa saa	. 1880 - Mariel de La Albande (n. 1865) - Associados Michael (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886) Michael (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886) - Associados (n. 1886)	And the second of the second o		All Photos	kina ya Arabiki na maakkii ga g	to a consisting which processes	eregrep problem i parti agi e		
	en deservit et de septembre de la companya de la co	inter i mentro pri proper i proper i proper e describado. Ki medici de Amerika pinas e in despuis Africa e insperimente.	nde eine wegen in 1828 in der dem de geste ein er hone ein de stelle eine ein der hone ein der des stelle eine ein der des stelle eines eine eine eine des stelle eines	et an entre en	el († 1860 mersen – 1866, rai). Hans de la companya (1866 mersen 1866 mersen 1	erra i ya Alabaki ia makabay ila Kata ziriak babba ili mala birila	ne o o ornaestes enco esco es Posto hill ha d'escatatet o vest	enage and an artist of the control o	and have about a	, , , , , , , ,
	An Charles of the control of the con	in the second of	nder derer varan service die eine var	The day of the state of the sta	et 3 - emmerces	ter gerinde de d	na i na indicata de la calenda	entering account to the second of the second		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
e de la compansión de l	to the second or the second of	in the second of	ada dan saga sagat di saga saga saga saga saga saga saga sag	nember für de eine eine eine eine eine eine eine e	ek (- emmerica	en en gelek de de ne nederlede en en Melek en en de blekker en end en binde blek en en Le en en de de de en en de de blek en	na in a consideration of the constant	and the party of the same of t		en de Br
en e	to describe the second control of the second	The state of the s	nde ann argument to a man argument and a state of the sta	Militar established establishe	et generates such estate e		na i ni n	enterent and enterent in the enterent and enterent in the ente		an in the first of
	An distributed delication of the state of th	The control of the co	Ada hara sayar ayadd d a sayar ay ay agaan a a a a ay agaa a a a a ay agaa a a a a	The discount of the second sec	en e		na i na anti-sentina sentina s Santa sentina s	entering account to the second of the second	*	
en e	en deservice de la capación de la ca	M. meller de la cida d	Advisor and control of the control o	Michael Maria (1964) and the second company of the second company	et for all and a control of a c	Brigario de Salada de Caracteria de Caracter	na i ni visionelles alconimiente Freit hit kuitassissistet vieski visionimien kuitassississississississi	A CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF TH		and the second of the second o
And the second s	to describe the second	An and the second of the secon	Ada dan sayar ng sad di di di dan sayar na mang sayar na m	Mir dan katikat na rikat yang melakat atau cidaktung melakat kan da rikat na melakat negari melakat atau cidaktun melakat kan da rikat negari negarah melakat melakat negara negarah da	et i commerce and color	Prince of the second sec	na a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a	enterent en		en en general de la companya de la c
en e	the desirence of the same of t	K. maka sakaraka kana atau da da da katakatan atau ang mana da da katakatan atau atau atau atau atau atau atau	Administration of the second o	The day of the control of the contro	en e	en garaga da agrada en entretario de la deservación de la deservac	na i	The control of the state of the		en e
en e	The second of th	K. mala adapting to a dispellation of the control o	And have super regard to the super s	Mile des destructions of the second control of the control of the second control of the control	et de commence de la constante		na i na na na nakatawa na na na	Consider the Constitution of the Constitution		and the second of the second o

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND POST-TEST ADMINISTERED AUGUST 15,1969 DMIT AS A SIXTH CHOICE

SCORE Z SCO. TR-SCO. FREQ. PCT. ONE * = 1 53 -2.07 292.52	And the second s
53 -2.07 292.52 1 3 * 54 -2.01 298.53 0 3 * 55 -1.95 304.53 0 3 * 56 -1.89 310.54 0 3 * 57 -1.83 316.54 0 3 * 58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	A MATERIAL CONTRACTOR OF THE STATE OF THE ST
53 -2.07 292.52 1 3 * 54 -2.01 298.53 0 3 * 55 -1.95 304.53 0 3 * 56 -1.89 310.54 0 3 * 57 -1.83 316.54 0 3 * 58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	A MATERIAL OF THE PROPERTY.
55 -1.95 304.53 0 3 * 56 -1.89 310.54 0 3 * 57 -1.83 316.54 0 3 * 58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	**************************************
56 -1.89 310.54 0 3 * 57 -1.83 316.54 0 3 * 58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	A MATERIAL OF THE PROPERTY OF
56 -1.89 310.54 0 3 * 57 -1.83 316.54 0 3 * 58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	
58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	A heat set district on the set of the set
58 -1.77 322.55 0 3 * 59 -1.71 328.55 0 3 * 60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3 *	e wellet the control of the control
60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3*	e hertstelden som er er en en som og som
60 -1.65 334.56 0 3 * 61 -1.59 340.56 0 3*	
61 -1.59 340.56	
	and the second section of the second second
62 -1.53 346.57 0 3 *	,
63 -1,47 352,57 0 3 *	
64 -1.41 358.57 0 3 *	
65 -1.35 364.58 0 3 *	
66 -1.29 370.58 0 3 *	** ***** ** *** * *** * * * * * * * *
67 -1.23 376.59	
	THE ME THE STATE OF THE PARTY OF
69 -1.11 388.60 0 14 *	
70 -1.05 394.60 0 14 *	garan nagamata ngaran na na na
71 -0.99 400.61 3 24 ***	
72 -0.93 406.61 0 24 *	# # Wind ## 1 / 2 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1
72 _0 97 417 42 21 44	
74 -0.81 418.62 0 31 *	in the annual following reference on the second
75 -0-75 424.63 0 31 *	
760.69 430.63 0 31 *	a way
77 -0.63 436.64 0 31 *	
78 -0.57 442.64 0 31 *	
79 -0.51 448.65 1 34 *	
80 -0.45 454.65 1 38 *	200 - 4.06 Millered, Co. de Cullere - a dell'2000 - C
81 -0.39 460.66 1 41 *	
82 -0.33 466.66 0 41 *	g /
83 -0.27 472.67 0 41 *	
The contract of the contract o	e ere i communicación personales de el
•	
The state of the s	The second second second
	•
The control of the co	er 🙀 🛨 - 🚧
The state of the s	
The Control of the Co	10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	•
the second of th	
94 0.39 538.72 1 62 *	•
95 0.45 544.73 1 66 *	
96	
子	or a feedit of 48 date of the 3
98 0.63 562.74 2 76 **	
99 0.69 568.75 0 76 *	And the second second section of the second
100 0.75 574.75 ' 0 76 *	
101 0.81 580.76 0 76 *	
102 0.87 586.76 0 76 *	,
103 0.93 592.76	prawizisko (fil. 1617 r. 1878) u militaria n iliuri

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND POST-TEST ADMINISTERED AUGUST 15,1969 DMIT AS A SIXTH CHOICE

MEAN=	87.552	SD= 16.	653 N=	29 RAN	1GE = 5	3-117
SCORE	Z SCO.	TR-SCO.	FREQ.	PCT.	ONE	* = 1
104	0.99	598.77	0	79	*	•
105	1.05	604.77	1	83	*	
106	1.11	610.78	Õ	83	*	
107	1.17	616.78	0	83	*	,
108	1.23	622.79	1	86	*	
109	1.29	628.79	ī	90	*	
110	1.35	634.80	1	93	*	
111	1.41	640.80	0	93	*	
112	1.47	646.81	0	93	*	
113	1.53	652.81	0	93	*	
114	1.59	658.82	1	97	*	
115	1.65	664.82	Ö	97	*	•
116	1.71	670.83	0	97	*	
117	1.77	676.83	1	100	*	

THE CHALLENGE OF ASSESING CURRICULUM CHANGES IN NEW ENGLAND OMIT AS A SIXTH CHOICE ADM IN ISTERED AUGUST 15,1969 POST-TEST STUDENT NAME SCORE STD. SCORE 'CT.RANK STA Z-SCORE **EV ANS** NORM AN 95 66 545. 0.45 6 MACFARLANE JRJAMES W 87 55 5 497. -0.03APTT FREDERS 67 2 -1.2310 377. PATRK W PHAUP 67 10 2. -1.23377. WINSLOW EDWARDF 110 93 8 635. 1.35 POPL AWSK I **FUGENEJ** 87 55 -0.035 497. DOUG W ABBOTT 108 86 1.23 7 623. HARNOIS HERMANA 71 24 3 -0.99 401. BARNES **EVFRETW** 98 76 **563.** 0.63 6 CORY B HOK ANS 98 76 563. 0.63 CAMERON PHILP **73** 31 -0.87413. DIXON RALPH E 79 34 -0.51449. GRODINSKY HARDL DM 80 38 -0.45 455. COGAN RICHARW 114 97 1, 59 659. ROY LUCY A 53 3 1 293. -2.07DARLING SCOTT 85 45 485. -0.15 HACKETT FR ANCID 68 14 3 383. -1.17VELMA E SIMPSON **73** 31 -0.87 413. ANN D 81 EMILIO 41 451. -0.39 OSBORNE DOUG 94 62 539. 0.39 MARSTON CHAR H 117 100 677. 1.77 TOMKINSON LESTE E 92 59 5 527. 0.27 GRAHAM **CONRADV** 71 24 3 401. -0.99 97 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 69 557. 0.57 LEWIS GEORGE 105 83 1.05 605. ROBT POTRIER Ð 71 24 401. -0.99

THE CHALLENG POST-TEST	DE UP ASSE ADMINISTER	ED AUG	UST 15,196			NGLAND SIXTH CHOICE
STUDENT	NAME		PCT . RANK	•	STD. SCORE	Z-SCORE
MURDOCK	ALLEN D	1 03	79	7	593.	0.93
LANCE	WILLTAW	86	48	5	491.	-0.09
RICE	ROBERTE	109	. 90	7	629.	1.29

GAIN AND PERCENT GAIN BETWEEN RAW SCORES SIGNIFICANCE TEST OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEANS

ABBOTT DOUGLAS APT FREDERICK APT APT APT APT APT APT APT APT APT APP APP	NT GAIN
APT FREDERICK 40. 67. 27.000 67.500 BARNES EVERETT 39. 98. 59.000 151.282 CAMERON PHILIP 45. 73. 28.000 62.222 COGAN RICHARD 70. 114. 44.000 62.857 DARLING SCOTT 58. 85. 27.000 46.551 DIXON RALPH 47. 79. 32.000 68.085 EMILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 199.090	
APT FREDERICK BARNES EVERETT BY	
BARNES EVERETT 39. 98. 59.000 151.282 CAMERON PHILIP 45. 73. 28.000 62.222 COGAN RICHARD 70. 114. 44.000 62.857 DARLING SCOTT 58. 85. 27.000 46.551 DIXON RALPH 47. 79. 32.000 68.085 EMILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
CAMERON PHILIP COGAN RICHARD TO. 114. 44.000 62.857 DARLING SCOTT 58. 85. 27.000 46.551 DIXON RALPH 47. 79. 32.000 68.085 EMILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
COGAN RICHARD DARLING SCOTT DARLING SCOTT DETAINS ALPH ATTERISED ANN BEMILIO ANN BEMILIO ANN BEMILIO ANN BEVANS NORMAN BELERSTEIN MARTIN BELESTEIN MARTIN BELERSTEIN MARTIN BELESTEIN MARTIN B	
DARLING SCOTT DIXON RALPH 47. 79. 32.000 68.085 EMILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 SS.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
## BIXON RALPH ## 47. 79. 32.000 68.085 ## BILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 ## EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 ## FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 ## GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 ## GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 ## HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 ## HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 ## HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 ## LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 ## LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 ## MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 ## MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 ## MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 ## OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 ## PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 ## POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 61.363 ## POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 ## RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ## ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 ## SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 ## TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
EMILIO ANN 39. 81. 42.000 107.692 EVANS NORMAN 61. 95. 34.000 55.737 FEUERSTEIN MARTIN 52. 97. 45.000 86.538 GRAHAM CONRAD 51. 71. 20.000 39.215 GRODINSKY HAROLD 66. 80. 14.000 21.212 HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 19.3921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
EVANS NORMAN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN FEUERSTEIN MARTIN FEUERSTEIN	
FEUERSTEIN MARTIN GRAHAM CONRAD GRAHAM CONRAD GRODINSKY HAROLD GGODINSKY HAROLD HACKETT FRANCES HARNOIS HERMAN HARNOIS HERMAN HOKANS CORY HANCE WILLIAM HAROLD HARNOES	
GRAHAM CONRAD GRODINSKY HAROLD GRODING GRODINSKY HAROLD GRODINSKY HAROLD GRODING GRODINSKY HAROLD GRODING GRODINSKY HAROLD GRODING G	
HACKETT FRANCES 48. 68. 20.000 41.666 HARNOIS HERMAN 45. 71. 26.000 57.777 HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	. ,
HACKETT FRANCES HARNOIS HERMAN HACKETT FRANCES HARNOIS HERMAN HOKANS CORY HOKANS CORY HOKANS CORY HOKANS CORY HOKANS CORY HOKANS GEORGE HARNOIS HERMAN HACKETT FRANCES HOFT HOKANS CORY HOWANS GEORGE HOWANS GEORG HOWANS GEORGE HOWAN	
HOKANS CORY 85. 98. 13.000 15.294 LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
LANCE WILLIAM 20. 86. 66.000 330.000 LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 PDIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER	
LEWIS GEORGE 42. 105. 63.000 150.000 MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
MARSTON CHARLES 67. 117. 50.000 74.626 MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	•
MACFARLANE JAMES 63. 87. 24.000 38.095 MURDOCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
MURDUCK ALLEN 41. 103. 62.000 151.219 OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
OSBORNE DOUGLAS 57. 94. 37.000 64.912 PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
PHAUP PATRICK 23. 67. 44.000 191.304 POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
POIRIER ROBERT 44. 71. 27.000 61.363 POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
POPLAWSKI EUGENE 70. 87. 17.000 24.285 RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
RICE ROBERT 95. 109. 14.000 14.736 ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
ROY LUCY ANNA 51. 53. 2.000 3.921 SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
SIMPSON VELMA 48. 73. 25.000 52.083 TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
TOMKINSON LESTER 44. 92. 48.000 109.090	
WINSLOW EDWARD 90. 110. 20.000 22.222	

T = 10.95039

X=raw score, pre test Y=raw score, post test

The t is significant at the 1% level for 27 degrees of freedom, thus the difference between the mean of X and the mean of Y is significantly different from zero.



A Pearson product correlation was calculated between the pre-test and post-test and that correlation turns out to be .54. The correlation coefficient then indicates that in fact the learning did have a differential effect on the participants involved over the six week period of time.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was calculated based on the raw score obtained on the pre-test and post-test for all institutees. Their ranks on the pre and post-test are given as well as the difference in rank, either plus or minus. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient is .49, indicating again the differential effect on the participants over the six week period. A second Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed based on order of finish on the post-test and raw score rank on the post-test. This resulted in a correlation coefficient of -.15, indicating very little correlation. A T test shows this correlation to be not significantly different from zero at the 10% level.

A split half reliability coefficient was calculated for both the pre-test and the post-test. The reliability of both the pre-test and the post-test turned out to be very high. The reliability coefficient for the pre-test is .92. The reliability coefficient for the post-test is .92. The overall evaluation of the institute then in terms of a pre-test, post-test design indicates: that the tests themselves were very reliable; that they validly tested the material which was being taught; and that there was a very substantial average gain in knowledge over the six week period.



At two week intervals the institute and its instructors were evaluated by the participants. They were asked to apply a four point scale that went from poor to excellent, with NA being not applicable. The calculations of the means of each of the eight areas of activity of the institute and of the personnel involved in the institute are presented at the end of this particular section.

The mean is calculated not only by category but also by grouping all of the categories and coming up with a single mean for that individual across eight areas or activities. In general all means are found to be in excess of three points indicating that the personnel associated with this institute were doing a good to excellent job.

PEARSON PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	* * *						
•	r		,		<i>:</i>		
AND THE SPECIAL VALUE OF THE S			,				
. X 78₩00	108 00						
40.00	108.00		•				
	67.00						
45.00	73.00						
70.00							
58.00	85.00	MEAN	OF X=	54.	te te	* * · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	••
47.00	79.00		OF X=		* *		,
39.00	81.00	—	DEV OF		17.68		The state of the s
1				Ang mer Kantang angkanapasa ang manga			,
52.00	97 • 00	rassahiki 🗃 eleka 👫 🎮 elek		COEFFIC		"5450	26
51.00	71.00 ~~		. **: "	GUETT IN	2,6214 1	# 2-4-20	
66.00	80.00	Б∀ ∦⊭	.5043	24	• AVV==	i.091993	
	68-00		5.50 mm.	•		70 . /	879010
45.00	71.00	areas de la Caración de la Caración de la Caración de	ant us as a mermana or district to the same a		i de rondes alle i si i i i en ji i i di di della	glid adaption of the over a district of the over	
1	71 • () () *********************************						
20.00	86.00	ozina na udalikomo nasukanasi.	क्षी क्षेत्री व ४८ २ - १ हर व्ययः प्रावस्त्राक्षणः द्वार्थः	दिरादेश्वेक ४४ व्हार व्हार व्हार व्हार १८०४ । -	ramen gara sessimentementemen en prijskoletije. Rei	が、 独立に設な ると「無器機ら出(事を必うなも)では、5、 東ウ	**(1) 2 g - 人 多中村・東京教育大学教育教育教育会会会
42.00							
- 1111							
67.00	117.00						
63.00	87.00						
41.00	103.00		k et				
CHE CONTINUES - 1 CO -	94.00					,	
23.00	67.00						4
70.00	71.00						,
70.00	87.00						
	109.00						
51.00	53.00						
44.00	73.00						
. ·	92.00						
Sommer to the fair The Control of	110.00						

X= raw score, pre test
Y= raw score, post test

The correlation coefficient of .545 indicates little correlation, with the six weeks having a differential effect on the people involved. Thus the increase can be attributed to learning over, the six week period. The square of this coefficient, .292, indicates that using either of the two regression lines as a means of prediction would produce only 29 % accuracy. These regression equations are:

Y = .50X + 60.09

X = .58Y + 2.88



SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

reasponentiam maintenancem as unimetrics. NAME antimities de la social (1907), comit (1907), comit (1907), social (1907), soci	, con la constitue de la const	Miles Calific Salar as before a states of	D.
EVANS NORMAN			-10.0
MAGFARLANE JAMES	2.0	14.5	-12.5
APT FREDERICK	3 • 0	27.5	-24.5
PHAUP PATRICK	(10.70 (10.70))	27.5	-23-5
WINSLOW EDWARD	#####################################	3.0	Productive Colorador in adaptivada
		14.5	-8.5
ABBOTT DOUGLAS	7.0	5.0	2.0
	managata na 8 y 0 aa	24.0	-16.0
BARNES EVERETT	9.0	8 • 5	. 5
HOKANS GORY	10.0	8.5	1,5
CAMERON PHILIP	Parketines (2) The property of the parketines of	21.5	-10-5
DIXON RALPH	12.0	20 - 0	-8.0
GRODINSKY HAROLD	17.742 35.4622 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 6 6 7 6 6 7 6 7 6 7 6	19.0	-6.0
COGAN RICHARD	14.0	2.0	12,0
ROY L. UCY ANNA	15.0	29.0	— 14.0
DARLING SCOTT	16.0	17.0	
HACKETT FRANCIS	Essenacy America (see and sections in the essential following the follow	26.0	-9.0
SIMPSON VELMA	18.0	21.5	-3.5
EMILIO ANN	2. (umaganéhikazada iku yura eyura (umen (magahisate) 19.0	18.0	Taketocomente (Santanon Caronocomente Antonocomente Antono
OSBORNE DOUGLAS	· 20 • 0	12.0	8.0

·	*		
POIRIER ROBERT	21.5	24.0	-2.5
TOMKINSON LESTER	21.5	13.0	8 • 5
LEWIS GEORGE	23.0	6.0	17.0
MURDOCK ALLEN	24.0	7.0	17.0
APT FREDERICK	25.0	27.5	-2.5
BARNES EVERETT	26.5	,8•5	18.0
EMILIO ANN	26.5	18.0	8.5
PHAUP PATRICK	28.0	27.5	•5
LANCE WILLIAM	29.0	16.0	13.0

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT= .497537

T= 2.98034

X= rank in class based on pre test raw score
Y= rank in class based on post test raw score
D= difference between ranks

Since the rank was determined by raw score, the correlation may be interpreted in the same way as the Pearson Product Moment Coefficient mentioned earlier. The t shows that the correlation is significantly different from zero at the 1 % level.



SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

NAME RICE ROBERT	X 1 • 0	Y 4.0	D
WINSLOW EDWARD	2.0	3.0	-1.0
HOKANS CORY	3.0	8.5	-5.5
ABBOTT DOUGLAS	4.0	5.0	-1.0
POPLAWSKI EUGENE	5.5	14.5	-9.0
COGAN RICHARD	5.5	2.0	3.5
MARSTON CHARLES	7.0	1.0	6.0
GRODINSKY HAROLD	8.0	19.0	-11.0
MACFARLANE JAMES	9.0	14.5	-5. 5
EVANS NORMAN	10.0	11.0	-1.0
DARLING SCOTT	11.0	17.0	-6.0
OSBORNE DOUGLAS	12.0	12.0	0.0
FEURESTEIN MARTIN	13.0	10.0	3.0
ROY LUCY ANNA	14.5	29.0	-14.5
GRAHAM CONRAD	14.5	24.0	-9.5
HACKETT FRANCIS	16.5	26.0	-9.5
SIMPSON VELMA	16.5	21.5	-5.0
DIXOM RALPH	18.0	20.0	-2.0
HARNOIS HERMAN	19.5	24.0	-4.5
CAMERON PHILIP	19.5	21.5	-2.0



MARSTON CHARLES	21.0	1. • 0	20.0
TOMKINSON LESTER	22.0	13.0	9.0
GRAHAM CONRAD	23.0	24.0	-1.0
FEURESTEIN MARTIN	24.0	10.0	14.0
LEWIS GEORGE	25.0	6.0	19.0
POIRIER ROBERT	26.0	24.0	2.0
MURDOCK ALLEN	27.0	. 7.0	20.0
LANCE WILLIAM	28.0	16.0	12.0
RICE ROBERT	29.0	4.0	25.0

CORRELATION COEFFICIENT= -.150000

T = -.78834

X= order of finish, post test
Y= rank in class based on raw score, post test

D= difference between ranks

The low negative correlation seems to indcate that what little correlation there is may be interpreted as the more time spent on the exam, the higher the rank in class. However, the t is not significant even at the 10 % level, and hence the correlation is not significantly different from zero.



RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT

100

ERIC Provided by ERIC

The reliability of both the pre-test and the post-test was tested by the split halves method. In both cases the test was split into raw scores for the even numbered questions, and raw scores from the odd numbered questions. The correlation between these scores should produce a reliability coefficient approaching 1 if the test is reliable. It is seen that for the pre-test immediately following, and later for the post-test, this is the case and the tests can be assumed reliable.

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT, PRE TEST

RAW SCORE EVEN RAW SCORE ODD

	,
48 .	45.
17.	23.
38.	29.
24.	24.
22.	29.
29.	23.
21.	18.
41.	37.
21.	21.
43.	42.
18.	26.
31.	30.
19,	2.5 •
J. 4 .	9 •
39.	24.
30.	28*
28.	29.
36.	34.
23 *	18.
20.	25.
26.	25.
12.	8.
25.	23.
35.	35.
46.	44.

RELIABILITY COFFFICIENT= .920554

22.

28.

20.

31.

; ";

55.

19.

19.

35.

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT, POST TEST

RAW SCORE EVEN RAW SCORE ODD

30.	30.
30.	23.
48.	47.
47,	48.
45.	41.
35.	32.
55.	53 .
41.	46.
53.	55.
39.	32.
4.9 .	49,
46.	52.
38.	34.
39.	40.
38.	42.
53.	60.
46	39.
33.	35.
31.	42.
43.	36.
44.	50.
60.	57.
43.	48.
36.	35. 35.
52.	53 _*
34.	37 .
3 4	57.
42.	21. 44.
. 55.	54 .
and and 🐞	> 4 •

RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT= . 919293

£....

INSTITUTE EVALUATIONS

At the end of each two week session, the institutees were asked to evaluate the presentations of the instructors. They were asked to respond to eight categories for each person, using a four point scale. (See evaluation forms) The results were reduced to means for each question, section means for each instructor, and total means for the particular two week session.

ERIC

Full Text Provided by ERIC

HEN INSTITUTE ' 69

PROGRESS CRITIQUE

Date:

Directions: We would like you to evaluate, as you see it, the progress of the HEW Institute and offer your constructive suggestions and criticisms of our activities to date. Listed below are some of the activities. materials, and personnel with whom you have had contact. Please respond to each of these major objectives by checking your feelings toward each product area listed to the right of the objective. Apply a four-point scale of Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Excellent, or NA-Not Applicable. Additionally, list in narrative form the perceived strengths and wedknesses of each presentation and your suggestions for improvement in pursuing the objective. Finally, use the reverse of the form for recording additional reactions to the Institute, and especially note your ideas concerning plausible objectives for the remaining week(s) of the Institute.

Activ	ity - Mater	ials - Personnel	Theory Under- Lying Object.	Text(s) and Library Matrls	ntary.	Clarity of Presentation	Cain in Fac- tual Knowledge	Comprehension of Objectives	Applicability of Objectives	[Verall Evaluation
Gil Aust	i n	the study of Behavioral Objectives, intro. to use of statistics								
Don Bail	ley	Intro, to computer programming								
Henry Wa	lbesser	Writing of Behavioral Objectives, creation of learning hierarchies								· 14 · 14 · 14 · 14 · 14 · 14 · 14 · 14
Richard	Rosen	Dr. Walbesser's assistant								
William	Grey	Dr. Walbesser's assistant								

FIRST EVALUATION-JULY 7-JULY 18

```
MEAN(1) = 3.64
NEAM( 2)= 3.55
7 EAH( 3)= 3.72
 ™HAM( 4)= 3.51
MEAN( 5)= 3.44
MEAM( 6)= 3.28
' NEAN( 7)= 3.17
MEAN( 8) = 3.58
MEAN( 9)= 3.14
MEAN(10)= 2.69
MEAN(11)= 3.09
MEAN(12) = 2.82
MEAN(13)= 3.39
PEAN(14)= 3.14
 EAN(15) = 3.14
-MEAH(16) = 3.17
FEAR(17)= 3.67
 MEAR(18) = 3.28
 MEAM(19)= 3.28
mEAN(20)= 3.44
                                  (1-8) Dr.Gilbert Austin
 MEAM(21) = 3.32
MEAM(22) = 3.21
                                  (9-16) Donald Bailey
 MEAH(23) = 3.03
 MEAN(24)= 3.37
                                  (17-24) Dr. Henry Walbesser
 MEAN(25) = 0.00
 MEAN(26) = 0.00
 MEAN(27) = 0.00
 FARAN(28)= 0.00
MEAN(29)= 0.00
 MEAN(30)= 0.00
 PEVM(31) = 0.00
 MEAR(32)= 0.00
 MEAN(33)= 0.00
 MEAN(34)= 0.00
 DEAR(35) = 0.00
 MEAN(36)= 0.00
 MEAN(37) = 0.00
 BEAH(38)= 0.00
 MEAN(39) = 0.00
 MEAN(40)= 0.00
 MEAN OF FIRST 8 3.491228
 MEAN OF SECULD 8 3.077981
 MEAN OF THIRD 8 3.331858
 MEAN OF FOURTH 8 0.000000
 MEAN OF FIFTH 8 0.000000
 TOTAL MEAN 3.303571
```

HEW INSTITUTE '69

PROGRESS CRITIQUE

Date:

Directions: We would like you to evaluate, as you see it, the progress of the HEW Institute and offer your constructive suggestions and criticisms of our activities to date. Listed below are some of the activities, materials, and personnel with whom you have had contact. Please respond to each of these major objectives by checking your feelings toward each product area listed to the right of the objective. Apply a four-point scale of 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Excellent, or NA=Not Applicable. Additionally, list in narrative form the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each presentation and your suggestions for improvement in pursuing the object're. Finally, use the reverse of the form for recording additional reactions to the Institute, and especially note your ideas concerning plausible objectives for the remaining week(s) of the Institute.

	se appreciated from the the	ing ha digere can an and an	Mariana and Maria Co.		ATUL I	いっこうしゅう くろうしゅうしゅうしょう	CK e		-
Activity - Mater	ials - Personnel	Theory Underlying Object.	Text(s) and Library Matris	Supplementary Materials	Clarity of . Presentation	Gain in Fac- tual Knowledge	Comprehension of Objectives	Applicability of Objectives	Overall Evaluation
Gil Austin	the study of the CIPP model and continuation of the study of statistics								
Don Bailey	continuation of computer programming				, , , ,				
Carl Kleiner	lectures on statistics								
Daniel Stufflebeam	CIPP Model				3 1 4				(f E
Bernard Barbadora	Dr. Stufflebeom's assistant								4 0 1 1 1 1
Michael D. Hock	Dr. Stufflebeam's assistant								1 1 1 1
William H. Spain	Dr. Stufflebeam's assistant				•				
	r				٧				

SECOND EVALUATION-JULY 21-AUGUST 1

```
MEAN(\cdot 1) = 3.66
MEAM(2) = 3.62
mEAN( 3)= 3.59
MEAM(4) = 3.77
DEAN(5) = 3.42
MEAN(6) = 3.46
MEAN( 7)= 3.46
MEAN( 8)= 3.64
MEAN(9) = 3.41
MEAN(10) = 3.18
MEAN(11)= 3.04
MEAN(12) = 3.27
MEAN(13) = 2.93
MEAN(14) = 3.00
MEAN(15) = 3.03
MEAN(16) = 3.17
MEAN(17) = 2.75
MEAN(18) = 2.93
                                    (1-8) Dr. Gilbert Austin
MEAN(19) = 2.93
MEAN(20) = 2.82
                                    (9-16) Donald Bailey
MEAN(21) = 2.58
MEAN(22) = 2.75
                                    (17-24) Carl Kleiner
MEAN(23) = 2.55
MEAN(24) = 2.68
                                    (25-32) Dr. Dahiel Stufflebeam
MEAN(25) = 3.67
MEAN(26) = 3.48
MEAN(27) = 3.37
MEAN(28) = 3.32
MEAN(29) = 3.35
MEAN(30) = 3.25
·MEAN(31)= 3.32
NEAN(32) = 3.46
MEAN(33) = 3.00
MEAN(34)= 3.00
MEAN(35) = 3.00
MEAN(36) = 2.00
MEAN(37) = 2.00
MEAN(38) = 2.00
MEAN(39) = 2.00
MEAN(40)= 2.00
MEAN OF FIRST 8 3.581818
MEAN OF SECOND 8 3.133928
MEAN OF THIRD 8 2.733009
MEAN OF FOURTH 8 3.404545
MEAN OF FIFTH 8 2.375000
```

TOTAL MEAN 3.212984



HEW INSTITUTE '69

PROGRESS CRITIQUE

Date:	
-------	--

Directions: We would like you to evaluate, as you see it, the progress of the HEW Institute and offer your constructive suggestions and criticisms of our activities to date. Listed below are some of the activities, materials, and personnel with whom you have had contact. Please respond to each of these major objectives by checking your feelings toward each product area listed to the right of the objective. Apply a four-point scale of 1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Excellent, or NA=Not Applicable. Additionally, list in narrative form the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each presentation and your suggestions for improvement in pursuing the objective. Finally, use the reverse of the form for recording additional reactions to the Institute, and especially note your ideas concerning plausible objectives for the remaining week(s) of the Institute.

Activity - M	aterials - Personnel	Theory Under- lying Object.	rext(s) and Library Matris	Supplementary Materials	Clarity of Presentation	Gain in Fac- tual Knowledge	Comprehension of Objectives	Applicability of Objectives	Overall Evaluation
Gil Austin	continuation of the education evaluation								
Don Bailey	continuation of computer programming					·			
Dr. Desmond Cook	PERT and Program Management								
Dr. John Cawley	Research Methodology								
Maurice Olivier	Systems Approach				•				· iii iii iii iii
Jim Carr	research at the State Department level					6 6 7 6 8			·
Don Randall	research at the State Department level		¥ \$ \$ \$ \$		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	7 1 6 6 1	4 9 9 9		
Dr. William Asher	Development, Dissemination and Adoption process								
y es	•		 !		• • • •	† 6 1			
e · · ·	,		; { } 6	7 8 8	! ! !	; ; ;	; ; ;	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	5 A R R

ERIC

THIRD EVALUATION-AUGUST 4-AUGUST 15

1.	•	
MEANT 17= 3.56	MEAN (33)= 2,48	MEAN(65)= 4.00
MEAM(2) = 3.66	5-EAH(34)= 1.66 €	MEAN(66) = 0.00
MEAN(3)= 3.52	FANNSS = 1.58	MEAN(67) = 0.00
MEAN(-4)= 3.73	MEAN (36) = -2.07	MEAN (68) = 0.00
MEAN(5)= 3.68	MEAN(37)= 2.16	MEAN(69) = 0.00
MEAN(6)= 3:65	MEAN(38)= 2.23	MEAN(70) = 0.00
MEAN(7)= 3.62	MEAH(39)= 2.23	MEAN(71) = 0.00
MEAN(8)= 3.62	MEAN(40)= 2.26	MEAN(72) = 0.00
MEAN(9)= 3.21	WEAN 41 = 2.16	MEAN(73) = 0.00
. MEAN(10) = 3.18	MEAN(42)= 2.30	MEAN(74) = 0.00
MEAN(11) = 3.00	MEAN(43)= 2.66	MEAN (75) = 0.00
MFAM(12) = 3.19	MEAN(44)= 2.80	MEAN(76) = 0.00
MEAN(13) = 3.26	MEAN(45)= 2.61	MEVIN LANGE O.00
MEAN(14) = 3.26	MEAM (46) = 12.88	MEAN (78) = 0.00
MEAN(15)= 3.29	MEAN (4.7) = 2.76	·MEAN(79)= 0.00
MEAN(16) = 3.16	MEAN(48) = 2.76	MEAN(80) = 0.00
MEAN(17)= 3.14	MEAN (49)= 3.07	MEAN OF FIRST 8 3.635359
MEAN(18) = 3.16	MEAN(50) = 2.77	MEAN OF SECOND 8 3 209580
MEAN(19)= 2.90	MEAN(31)= 2.90	MEAN OF THIRD 8 2.887804
MEAN(20)= 2.88	MEAN(52) = 3.19	MEAN OF FOURTH 8 3 386363
MEAN(21)= 2.62	MEAN 153 1 = 2.88	MEAN OF FIFTH 8 2. [6111]
MEAN(22) = 2.88	MEAN(54) = 3.11	MEAN OF SIXTH 8 2.731428 .
MEAN(23)= 2.59	MEAN(55)= 2.88	MEAN OF SEVENTH 8 B. 011111
MEAN(24) = 2.92	MEAN(56) = 3.03	MEAN OF EIGHTH 8 3,572139
MEAN(25) = 3.37.	MEAN(57)= 3.62	MEAN OF NINTH 8 4.000000
MEAN(26) = 3.33	MEAN(58) = 3.45	MEAN OF TENTH 8 0.000000
MEAN(27)= 3.40	WEANID 91 En 3 . 44 common	TOTAL MEAN 3.078444
MEAN(28) = 3.47	MEAN(60) = 3.65	
MEAN(2,9)= 3.33	MEAN(61)= 3.44	rez _act gas to annoque annoque annoque (annoque annoque
MEAN(30) = 3.45	MEAN(62) = 3.62	
MEAN(31)= 3.29	MEAN(63)= 3.59	・ UES Met Service Tarmen Man 可能 (Astronomical Respondent community services educate (Application of Application of Applicati
MEAN(32) = 3.41	MEAN(64) = 3.66	Nagaran

(1-8) Dr. Gilbert Austin (9-16) Donald Bailey (17-24) Dr. Desmond Cook (25-32) Dr. John Cawley (33-40) Maurice Olivier (41-48) James Carr (49-56) Donald Randall (57-64) Dr. William Asher) Earlier in this report we have already indicated the proposed learning sequence. We will now report the evaluation of each of those proposed sequences. The first week was spent in a general familiarization process with the ideas and concepts behind stating desired education outcomes in the form of behavioral objectives. The second week of the institute was spent in an intensive work session with Dr. Henry Walbesser assisted by Richard Rosen and William Gray. The schedule for that week's work is found immediately following this section. It is not possible to report statistically on this particular section as Dr. Walbesser's pre-test only tested whether the behavior was or was not exhibited. It was, however, possible to count the number of people in each category that exhibited the behavior or did not. Therefore, the following information is presented:

BEHAVIOR REQUESTED	NUMBER EXHIBITING BEHAVIOR
Name the action verb given a performance class definition	21
Name the hypothesis tested by the adequacy ratio	2
Name the least number of hypotheses of learning dependencies needed for a learning hierarchy	5
Describe the necessary components of an HLD	4 .
Construct at least two performance classes from a list of verbs	. 24
Identify statements that describe observable per- formances	. 26



Construct an assessment task and the acceptable responses for a performance class made by the learner	2
Construct an assessment task and the acceptable responses given the statement of a behavioral objective	2
Identify and name the six components of a behavioral objective given in Walbesser's definition	29
Identify statements which satisfy the first three components of a behavioral objective given a list of statements	27
Identify each of the HLD given a description of a hypothesis	20
Construct a behavioral objective and an assessment task given a non-behavioral objective	2
Describe two causes for rejecting a HLD	1
Describe when a behavioral objective and an assessment task are in performance agreement	1
Name two characteristics of an assessment task	0
Describe changes that can be made in an assessment task	0
Name the least number of action verbs in a behavioral objective	17
Name two references on constructing behavioral objectives	17



It is not possible to make any direct comparison between the pre-test and the post-test since they were very different tests. It is, however, possible to reach the generalized conclusion that the participants learned a good deal over this two week intensive period of studying behavioral objectives as judged by the fact that most of them were able to complete successfully the first two of the requests on the final test. Many fewer did as well on the third and most difficult portion of that final examination. The list of the tasks on the pre and post-test and the documentation as to their presence or absence will be found in Appendix B.

As is evident by careful study of the plan for this week there thirtyseven (37) tasks that each participant had to complete. A complete copy
of these thirty-seven (37) tasks and their objectives will be found in
Appendix B.

POST-TEST

BEHAVIOR REQUESTED	NUMBER EXHIBITING BEHAVIOR
Identify and name all of the HLD given a schematic of a learning hierarchy	22
Demonstrate the procedures for validating a learning hierarchy	16
Construct explanations and revisions for those hypotheses of learning dependency rejected by the validation data	5



Schedule:

Monday

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Preassessment measure
- 3. Meet with consultant in smaller group
- 4. Construct small teams
- 5. Complete Set A Tasks 1-5
- 6. Seminar for all participants Learning Hierarchies

Tuesday

- 1. Complete Set B Tasks 6 13
- 2. Complete Set C Tasks 14 19
- 3. First, second, and third group viewing of TV tape on the use of behavioral objectives by new teachers

Wednesday

- 1. Complete Set D Tasks 20-24
- 2. Complete Set E Tasks 25-29
- 3. Seminar for all participants Hierarchy Validation Ratios

Thursday

- 1. Complete Set F Tasks 30-33
- 2. Complete Set G Tasks 34-36

Friday

ERIC

- 1. Complete Set H Task 37
- 2. Seminar for all participants What Next
- 3. Postassessment measure

The third week of the institute was spent in an intensive study of various methods of evaluating educational research. Particular emphasis was given to the use of context, input, process and product (CIPP) evaluation developed by Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam of Ohio State University. The participants were also exposed to and studied intensively the book authored by Campbell and Stanley known as Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. The material that the participants in this institute were asked to read and study during this particular two week period of time will be found in Appendix C and is listed below:

"Evaluation as Enlightenment for Decision-Making".
Daniel L. Stufflebeam

"Process Approach in Biology Instruction" Kurtz, Edinger, Ferko and Murray

"Context Evaluation of Instruction in Local School Districts"
Robert Hammond

"The Countenance of Educational Evaluation"
Robert E. Stake

"Evaluation at the Local Level" Dr. Robert L. Hammond

The fourth week of the institute was given over to an intensive study of the use of the CIPP model in educational evaluation. This week was conducted by Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam and three assistants from Ohio State. University. Their names: Bernard Barbadora, Michael Hock and William Spain. The participants in the institute were given a pre-test and a post-test designed by Dr. Stufflebeam and his assistants. Dr. Stufflebeam and his staff have prepared a product evaluation of their one week participation in this institute. It will be found immediately following this section.

As careful study of the master schedule of events will indicate the participants had a very busy week. A great deal of time was spent working on a simulation exercise entitled, "Simulated Local School Evaluation: Materials for a Training Institute in Evaluation", created by Blaine R. Worthen and Michael D. Hock. There are no available copies of this manuscript.



MASTER SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

for

NEW HAMPSHIRE EVALUATION INSTITUTE

JULY 28 - AUGUST 1



1			<u> </u>	den en e			i pakulanja arranja probajaji si referensis nan referensiska.	an buluntur den de			MP P TO A. TO TAKE !	yn dywydd arwyd y gladgaed y ar y maindy ronaigh		ing and supplied the supplied of the supplied			and the same of	+	
Friday	Response to	TASK V	SPAIN Design of Evaluation	STUFFLEBEAM	Product Evaluation Design	COFFEE	BARBADORA Final Evaluation	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		רחשרש	manung panak kum da pemerunga	panggap pinangan sangga sara		ng Pay a kin Makaya sa Bang May Santin	المناسب المناسبة المراجعة				
	(8:30	9:00		10:00	10:30	8.			12:00	Total No.	·	gan et al	''' or upp you by by non-nibolate had been been been been been been been bee					
Thursday		Nestions & Concerns	HCCK Input Evaluation	Introduction to	TASK IV	COFFEE	Wrap Up of	1 ~ ~	!	LUNCH	TASK V	HOCK	į.	Group and	Individual	Discussion of	Projects		
*	har (** ************************		9:00	9:30	,	10:30	11:00	11:30		12:00	1:00	2:00	to 2:30	ζ.		10.30	2		
Wednesday	STAFF	Respond to 8:30 Questions & Concerns	TASK 11 Continued	Another Look	at Context Evaluation	COFFEE	Introduction to	enter enter exten exten exten SS SI Fun		LUNCH	TASK III Continued	Response to	TASK 11		FREE				
		8:30	9:00		10:00	10:30	11:00			12:00	1:00 TASK	2:00	to 2:30		от добов руз той рассой	t (Militaria meneral describilista y ma			-
Tuesday	HOCK	Context	Evaluation		Introduction to Simulation	COFFEE	Simulation	TASK 1		LUNCH	TASK Continued	Response to TASK 1	TASK L	Group and	Individual	Discussion			tes,
	- Charles - L ea	8:30		ana ingira paga ayan ayan ayan ayan ayan	10:00	10:30	00:11			12:00	1:00	2:00	2:30	14) 	8:30	Ç	90:		
Monday	STUFFLEBEAM		BARBADORA Initial Evaluation	SPAIN	Problems In Evaluation	COFFEE	ARBADOF	Definition of Evaluation		LUNCH	STUFFLEBEAM	Detail of The CIPP Model		Meeting With	Team Leaders	Fo	Simulation		
		8:30	9:00	9:30		10:30	11:00			12:00	00:1	ç	2:30	7:00	to	8:00			.)

PRODUCT OF EVALUATION SECTION FOR THE FINAL REPORT

NEW HAMPSHIRE EVALUATION INSTITUTE
JULY 28 - AUGUST 1, 1969

Prepared By
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
EVALUATION CENTER STAFF

Bernard M. Barbadora Michael Hock William Spain Daniel L. Stufflebeam



In an effort to summarize, describe, and assess the impact of the recent Evaluation Institute conducted at the University of New Hampshire the following report has been prepared.

In response to the question: Has your understanding of evaluation been considerably broadened as a result of the Institute activities and experiences?

All of the participants responded affirmatively.

Concerning our inquiry relating to the participants general reaction as to how they would best describe the institute, the following statistics were obtained:

I out of 29 of the participants responded - Very Unfavorable

1 out of 29 of the participants responded - Neutral

2 out of 29 of the participants responded - Slightly Favorable

25 out of 29 of the participants responded - Very Favorable

Relating to the questions: How relevant the Evaluation Institute was to the participant's background, problems, and needs:

I out of 29 of the participants responded

The information generated by the institute was too difficult to was stand and to be able to benefit from the information.

3 out of 29 of the participants responded

I understand almost everything, but the Institute didn't help me solve my most important problems or meet my basic needs.

25 out of 29 of the participants responded

The Evaluation Institute dealt with my problems and needs in an unda. standable and interesting way.



In trying to arrive at some descriptive evaluation data as to how well the Evaluation Institute achieved its basic objectives, the following figures were obtained:

OBJECTIVE 1

To have the participants be able to identify the various stages of the CIPP Evaluation Model, and apply these stages in various task situations in a given simulated evaluation problem. The participants understanding of the various stages will be determined in terms of an oral and written response to each task in the simulation and by an institute reaction scale.

The results of the data indicated that twenty-five out of twentynine of the participants, as determined by their responses and the
institute reaction scale, were able to identify, and be aware of the
problems and limitations in the various stages of CIPP Evaluation.

A total of two participants seemed to be uncertain about identifying
the various stages, and the remaining two participants attained a small
fraction of success in terms of identifying and becoming aware of the
problems or limitations of the various stages of CIPP.

OBJECTIVE 11

The total group mean gain of the participants, in terms of increased knowledge about the realm of CIPP Evaluation, will shift to a higher mean as determined by the results of an evaluation achievement examination.*



^{*}Statistical results in terms of attaining the last two objectives can be found in the data summary contained in the report.

OBJECTIVE III

The participants attitudes (receiving, responding, valuing, characterizing, and organizing) will be more favorable as a result of the institute as determined by an attitude scale administered on a pre and post test basis.*

Due to the fact that in the <u>pre</u>-test of participants one person arrived late, his attitude scale had to be eliminated from the <u>post</u> test analysis. Therefore, N = 28 on the attitude survey.

ATTITUDE SCALE

In respect to the attitude instrument, the five point Likert*

Scale was used to determine participants performance. The scale has a range of from one to five points with the weight one representing a definite negative rating, to the weight of five which is the most positive. Each item on the test is individually rated and then a total score is computed by summarizing each particular item. (Total score on this particular test could have ranged from 34 - least positive to 170 - most positive.) By dividing the total score by the number of items on the particular test, the resulting score will then fall along the five point continuium.

with this basic information in mind, and using the criteria established by the Likert Scale, the following characteristics were evident in statistically comparing and contrasting the <u>pre</u> and <u>post</u> test attitude scale:

^{*}Statistical results in terms of attaining the last two objectives can be found in the data summary contained in the report.

^{*}D. Krech, D. Crutchfield, and E. L. Ballachey. <u>Individual and Society</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963. (Especially Chapter 5).

Pre Test Number of Examinees	n	#22	28
Post Test Number of Examinees	n	*	. 28
Number of Items on the Pre Test		3 00	34
Number of Items on the <u>Post</u> Test.		**	34
Average Total Score of the Pre Test		***	135.46
Mean Item Score for the Group	•	***	3.92
Average Total Score for the Post Test			142.04
Mean Item Score for the Group		127	4.18
Pre Test Standard Deviation	Ø	***	15.77
Post Test Standard Deviation	σ	***	11.94
Variance of the <u>Pre</u> Test			248.61
Variance of the Post Test		anc.	148.26

In respect to the Evaluation Achievement Examination, certain points will now be amphasized in order to enable the reader to more clearly analyze the statistical data that were generated through the utilization of the instrument.

- 1. The range of possible scores could have extended from 0 to 30.
- 2. The complete test was objective in nature.
- 3. Correct answers were assigned a weight of one.
- 4. On both examinations N = 29.
- 5. The examination was administered on a pre and post test basis.
- 6. Names were not included, so, an error term could not be computed, and a significance test between <u>pre</u> and <u>post</u> test means could not be calculated.

Then, in terms of a statistical comparison and contrast between the pre and post test Evaluation Achievement Examination, the following characteristics were evident:

Pre Test Number of Examinees		n ·	29
Post Test Number of Examinees		n, ···	29
Number of Items on the Pre Test		1692	30
Number of Items on the Post Tost		*	30
Pro Test Mean		***	12.86
Post Test Mean			16.31
Pre Test Standard Deviation		σ =	3.38
Post Test Standard Deviation		♂ ×	2.31
Pre Test Range of Scores	7 - 19	:##	12
Post Test Range of Scores	12 - 20	**	8
Pre Test Median		***	12.50
Post Test Median		**	16.50
Pre Test Mode	•		14
Post Test Mode	``````````````````````````````````````	**	17
Variance of the <u>Pre</u> Test		*	11.42
Variance of the Post Test		***	5.35

In summarizing these two sets of data, it could be stated that the participants attitude toward the realm of educational evaluation definitely increased. Specifically, there was a 6.58 point gain of total score on the post test.

With respect to the Evaluation Achievement Examination, the results can be summarized by stating: that the mean, median, and mode, all increased in post testing, while the standard deviation was lowered.

Specifically, there was a group mean gain in the achievement scores from pre testing to post testing of 3.45 points.

Thus, as a result of the data obtained from our week long Evaluation

Institute we are lead to conclude that the institute had a favorable

impact on the participants both in terms of making their attitudes more

favorable toward evaluation, and increasing their knowledge about evaluation.

DATA SUMMARY

on

Pre and Post Test

EVALUATION ACHIEVEMENT EXAMINATION



PRE TEST STATISTICAL DATA EVALUATION ACHIEVEMENT EXAMINATION NEW HAMPSHIRE INSTITUTE

	X Score	f	x'	fx'	· ×12	f(x ¹²)
É	19	ĵ	6	6	36	36
	18	2	5	10	25	50
	17	2	4	. 8	16	32
	16	3	3	9	9	27
	15	1	2	2	4	4
	14	5	1	5	1	5
Assumed 0	13	į	0	0	0	0
	12	2	-1	-2	1	2
	11	3	-2	-6	4	12
	10	3	-3	-9	· 9	27
	9	4	-4	-16	16	64
	8	1	-5	- 5	25	25
	7	_1	-6	<u>-6</u>	36	<u>36</u>
		N = 2	9	-4		320

 $M = Assumed Mean + \sum fx'$

$$M = 13 + \frac{-4}{29/4.00} = 12.86$$

$$\frac{29}{1.10}$$
1.16

Mean = 12.86

Mode = 14

Range = 7-19 = 12

Median = 13.50

 $\sigma = 3.38$

Variance = 11.41

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{N(\Sigma f \times^{12}) - (\Sigma f \times^{1})^{2}}{N(N-1)}}$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{29(320) - (-4)^{2}}{29(29-1)}} = 3.38$$

13.00 -.14 12.86

POST TEST STATISTICAL DATA EVALUATION ACHIEVEMENT EXAMINATION NEW HAMPSHIRE INSTITUTE

	X Score	'f	x¹	fx'	×12	f(x ¹²)
•	20	3	4	12	16	48
	19	2	3	6	9	. 18
	18	4	2	. 8	4	16
	17	8	1	8	1	8
Assumed	0 16	3	0	0	0	0
	15	3	-1	-6	1	3
	14	2	-2	-4	4	8
	13	Ì	-3	-3	9	9
	12	_3	-4	-12	16	<u>48</u>
		N = 2	9	9		158
	M = Assu	med Mea	n +Σfv	, t		

M = Assumed Mean +
$$\sum f x^T$$

Mean = 16.31

Mode = 17

Range = 12-20 = 8

Median = 16.69

 $\sigma = 2.36$

Variance = 5.54

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{N(\Sigma f x^{12}) - (\Sigma f x^{1})^{2}}{N(N-1)}}$$

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{29(158) - (9)^{2}}{29(29-1)}} = 2.36$$

The last two weeks of the institute were given over to two-day and one-day seminars directed by visiting consultants. The alternate days were filled in with discussion with the director of the institute, in an attempt to pull together the material that was being presented on the part of the consultants. It was not possible to create any pre-test or post-test for these short two-day seminars, but the consultants were evaluated, as we have already indicated, on evaluation forms at the end of the two week period. Dr. Desmond Cook of Ohio State University was a consultant for two days. The topic of his discussion was "Educational Program Management" and PERT as a tool within that management concept. Dr. Cook had a very lengthy and well developed overhead transparency presentation and the interaction with the institute trainees seemed to be excellent. For two days previous to Dr. Cook's attendance at the institute the trainees had been required to read the book he had authored entitled, "Program Evaluation and Review Technique" and "A Generalized Project Management System Model", Immediately following this section you will find the outline that Dr. Cook presented in his discussion with the participants over the two days he was here.

Dr. John Cawley from the University of Connecticut came for a one-day seminar in which he discussed the problems associated with conducting educational research in a school situation. Particular area of concentration was his research in psychomoter difficulties in the area of reading.



Educational Program Management Center Educational Development Faculty College of Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210

Outline for Project Management Presentation

- 1. Why Project Management in Education?
- II. The Nature of Project Management
 - A. Project Characteristics ..
 - B. Management Functions and Processes
 - C. Management Systems
- III. Generalized Project Management Model
 - A. Planning Systems
 - 1. Project Definition
 - 2. Work Flow
 - 3. Time Estimation
 - 4. Scheduling and Resource Allocation
 - 5. Cost Estimating and Budget
 - B. Control System
 - 1. Reports
 - 2. Management Actions
 - 3. Implementation and Recycling

Mr. Maurice Olivier made a one-day presentation on the subject of "Systems Thinking, Systems Analysis and Its Implications for Education". The participants were asked to read in preparation for this presentation the booklet entitled, "What is the Systems Approach and What's in it for Administrators". A copy of this pamphlet will be found in Appendix E of this report.

One day of the institute was given over to a presentation by personnel from the New Hampshire State Department of Education: Dr. Donald Randall, consultant for research and testing and James Carr, consultant for guidance and counseling. Their general topic was, "The Implications of Research Based on the Results of Five Statewide Testing Programs in the state of New Hampshire, at Grades 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10".

The final consultant available to the summer research institute was Dr. William Asher from Purdue University. The topic of his presentation was "Development, Dissemination and Adoption", a copy of which will be found in Appendix F. Dr. Asher spent the first day of his presentation in discussing with the participants the problems associated with development, dissemination and adoption of educational research findings to actual and practical application on the part of educators dealing with students. The second day of Dr. Asher's presentation was spent in acting as a consultant to the individual participants and reviewing their proposals and making critical comments based on them. You will find the general outline of Dr. Asher's topic immediately following this section.



In Appendix F of this report you will find a paper entitled, "The Ingredients of a Research Proposal" which was given to the participants as a guide for their preparation of a terminal project which was required of all of them. The titles of each of the participants' projects will be found immediately following this page.

During the entire period of the institute the participants were taught statistizs that were appropriate and necessary for their use. This task was done by Carl Kleiner, a work-study student, majoring in mathematics, assigned to the Bureau. He had worked closely with the director in planning this institute. Selected statistics were taught from the following texts:

"Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education" by George A. Ferguson

"Non-parametric Statistics" by Sidney Siegel



This report so far has dealt only with the activities which took place in the morning and in some cases the first part of the afternoon and in the evening. The institute had as part of its proposed training exposure to the problems associated with running a computer and writing computer programs. The following is a description of what took place in this institute in terms of computer programming.

First week: At the first class meeting, each member of the Institute was asked to write a brief description of his previous experience with computers, if any. One person was very familiar with the Dartmouth computer and had worked with one of its remote terminals in his school (Concord). Several members of the Institute had made brief visits to computation centers, but the vast majority of the class had not even seen a computer. On the basis of this information, it was decided that the instruction would start at the most elementary level.

The objectives of the class were stated at the first meeting: that each member of the institute would become familiar with the FORTRAN language and write a successful computer program to do some type of data reduction which would be useful in his school system. The computer program was to be related to the research which the member was doing for his individual project if the research project was one which required data reduction. If a research project did not require data reduction, the student was allowed to write a computer program of comparable difficulty to others being done for the class.



The instructional portion of the class was begun with a general description of what a computer is, what it can and cannot do, and how it may be used as a useful tool in high school testing and instruction as well as in other fields. A simplified description of the internal workings of the computer was presented, and various types of input/output devices were discussed. Each student received instruction in the use of a keypunch and punched his name as an assignment. Relevant readings in Chapter 1 of "A Guide to Fortran Programming", were assigned.

A simple FORTRAN program to read, punch and print a list of names was presented in class. A step-by-step relationship between the FORTRAN program and the computer steps executed as a result of the FORTRAN instruction was discussed at great length.

At the first possible opportunity, the class was taken to see the IBM 1620 computer system at the University. This computer system is small, and relatively easy to use in demonstrating the operation of computers in general. This "first-hand" look at a computer system gave the students the opportunity to see what the equipment being discussed in class looked like physically. It also demonstrated the operation of the computer and its peripheral equipment as a system. Each student had keypunched his name on a card, and these cards were collected at the beginning of the demonstration. At the conclusion of the demonstration, the cards were listed using the program presented in class to demonstrate the usefulness and speed of the computer system in preparing a class roster. An error was introduced into the program to demonstrate the error-detecting capability of the FORTRAN compiler.



Second Week: The computer program which was used in the first week's demonstration was reviewed, and questions about the computer system were answered. The purposes of the FORTRAN compiler program and subroutines were also discussed. This discussion was followed by a discussion of the corresponding processes of the IBM 360 computer system and its associated remote terminals. Each student was asked to punch a modified version of the original demonstration program and run it with his own data on the 360 computer system. The proper job control cards were provided for each student, and a visit was made to the 360 area of the Computer Center in order to explain the steps in preparing a job for this machine.

The remainder of this week was used for discussing other types of FORTRAN statements and constants and variables used in FORTRAN programs. Chapters 2 and 3 and part of Chapter 4 were assigned in the text.

Third Week: Flow diagrams were presented, and several examples were used to demonstrate their usefulness. Students were asked to prepare a flow diagram for computing the mean and standard deviation of a set of test scores. A standard solution to the problem was discussed at the next class meeting. Each student was then asked to write a FORTRAN program from the flow diagram and run the program with actual data on the 360 system. A similar assignment was made for the computation of a Pearson-product moment correlation coefficient. These statistical programs were related to material which had been presented in other portions of the institute.



Fourth Week: Subscripted variables, including table look-ups, do-loops, and the DIMENSION statement were discussed. Addition and multiplication of array elements were presented and related assignments were given from the text. A program for finding the largest element in an array was presented and an assignment to find the range of a set of scores using the basic concepts of this program was given. Reading assignments were given from Chapter 5 and 6 in the text.

Fifth and Sixth Weeks: No formal classes were held. Each student was to work on his computer program with the instructor and other personnel from the Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services acting as consultants. The major emphasis of these last two weeks was on the participants using the remote terminal to the IBM 360 as they worked on their own projects. All of the students appeared to take the computer project very seriously, and many of them made repeated visits to the Bureau to discuss failures or successes of their programs. Each student fulfilled the requirement for the computer part of the institute, and many expressed the feeling that this experience would be very useful to them when they returned to their schools in the fall.

Immediately following is a list of Computer Programs done by the participants of the institute.

The computer portion of this institute was conducted by Donald Bailey, a Computer Programmer for the Bureau of Educational Research and Testing Services.



PROGRAM TO COMPUTE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, AND COEFFICIENT OF VARIATION Cory Hokans

A PROGRAM TO COMPUTE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION AND STANDARD ERROR OF DIFFERENCE OF X AND Y SCORES Charles H. Marston

A PROGRAM TO COMPUTE STANINES Velma E. Simpson

CORRELATIONS OF IQ AND ACHIEVEMENT SCORES Norman Evans

SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM EVALUATION OF MERRIMACK VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT Martin Fewerstein

STANDARD DEVIATION, MEAN AND MODE OF TWO GROUPS OF SCORES Herman Harnois

PROGRAM TO PRINT COUNSELOR, DATE AND TIME FOR DAILY ACTIVITIES OF A COUNSELOR AND TO KEEP A RUNNING TALLY OF THE TIME IN EACH ACTIVITY Scott Darling

PROGRAM TO COMPUTE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN TWO VARIABLES Ann Emilio

MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF VARIOUS SCORES WILLIAM W. Lance

PROGRAM TO USE WITH BI-LINGUAL SURVEY FOR BERLIN AREA Conrad Graham

A PROGRAM TO SHOW THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN THE SCORES ON THE CALIFORNIA READING 1EST AND THE STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST Les Tombinson



COMPUTATION OF THE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, AND STANDARD SCORE ON A TEST THAT WAS ADMINISTERED TO STUDENTS AND TO COMPARE THESE RESULTS WITH THE NATIONAL NORM FOUND IN THE MANUAL OF THE STANDARDIZED READING SURVEY
Sister Lucy Anna Roy

PROGRAM TO SHOW THE EFFECT OF PLACEMENT IN A TRANSITIONAL CLASS ON CHILDREN ENTERING THE FIRST GRADE AT SOUTH SCHOOL, LYNNFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS Richard W. Cogan

PROPOSAL TO EVALUATE OUR SCHOOL'S READING, GRADES 1-3
James MacFarlane

PLOTTING AND FLOW CHART ANALYSIS Edward Winslow

PROGRAM TO COMPUTE MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION, CORRELATION COEFFICIENT, REGRESSION LINE OF TWO VARIABLES

Douglas Abbott

PROGRAM TO LIST PHYSICS TEACHERS IN MAINE AND GET AVERAGE COST OF COURSE STATEWIDE AND BY TOWN Harold Grodinsky

PROGRAM TO COMPUTE STANDARD DEVIATION Francis Hackett

A PROGRAM TO GRADE STUDENTS
Pat Phaup

PROGRAM FOR CALCULATING MEAN AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF N SCORES Douglas Osborne

PROGRAM FOR PRINTOUT OF STUDENT NAME, IQ, PRE-TEST, POST-TEST, ACHIEVEMENT AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FOR IQ AND ACHIEVEMENT TEST

Gene Poplawski



PROGRAM TO COMPUTE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT AL Murdock

PROGRAM FOR EVALUATION OF PROJECT HEAD START Frederick Apt

PROGRAM TO COMPUTE GRADE POINT AVERAGE. Robert O. Poirier

PROGRAM TO FIND THE MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION, AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT Phil Cameron

A PROGRAM TO FIND THE CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN TWO VARIABLES Robert E. Rice

PROGRAM WHICH SORTED PRE-TEST DATA, COMPUTED MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATION RANGE AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT George Lewis

PROGRAM FOR COMPUTING CORRELATION COEFFICIENT BETWEEN IQ AND VOCABULARY FOR GRADE TWO Everett Barnes Jr.

PROGRAM FOR COMPUTATION OF STANDARD DEVIATION AND CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF ACHIEVEMENT TEST Ralph Dixon



CONCLUSION

This report has taken the form of an evaluation. The specific format of that evaluation is the CIPP model.

Context Evaluation

The information presented in the first part of this report is a context evaluation. It defines the needs for and generalized plan for the running of the institute, it identifies the place it will be conducted, and in general specifies the types of people who will be invited to attend it.

Input Evaluation

The second phase of this report is an input evaluation in which the author documents the various inputs which were available to the participants of this particular institute. These inputs took the form of presented material, by both the director of the institute and visiting lecturers, as well as a very heavy schedule of reading materials to be studied on the participants' own time.

Process Evaluation

It is hoped that this report documents very specifically and in behaviorally expressed objectives just what it was that the institute director planned to have happen to the participants. The entire institute itself was laid out in the form of a PERT chart so that there was a maximum concern with the interfacing of one particular section of this institute with those which preceded it and those which followed it. Therefore, it was possible to evaluate the progress of the participants and modify the



program to meet their expressed and observed needs.

Product Evaluation

The many pre-test, post-test situations which have already been discussed in this report, I think, justify the fact that it achieved the specific objectives that it set out for itself. On the basis of these four evaluations - context, input, process and product-it is the feeling of the author that he "practiced what he preached". It is the author's general feeling that this was a very successful summer research institute.